arXiv:1203.6432v8 [math.DS] 4 Mar 2013

Equilibrium states and invariant measures for random dynamical systems

Ivan Werner
Email: ivan_werner@mail.ru

March 5, 2013

Abstract

Random dynamical systems with countably many maps which admit countable Markov partitions on complete metric spaces such that the resulting Markov systems are uniformly continuous and contractive are considered. A non-degeneracy and a consistency conditions for such systems, which admit some proper Markov partitions of connected spaces, are introduced, and further sufficient conditions for them are provided. It is shown that every uniformly continuous Markov system associated with a continuous random dynamical system is consistent if it has a dominating Markov chain. A necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of an invariant Borel probability measure for such a non-degenerate system with a dominating Markov chain and a finite (14) is given. The condition is also sufficient if the non-degeneracy is weakened with the consistency condition. A further sufficient condition for the existence of an invariant measure for such a consistent system which involves only the properties of the dominating Markov chain is provided. In particular, it implies that every such a consistent system with a finite Markov partition and a finite (14) has an invariant Borel probability measure. A bijective map between these measures and equilibrium states associated with such a system is established in the non-degenerate case. Some properties of the map and the measures are given.

MSC: 37Hxx, 82B26, 82C05, 60G10, 37H99
Keywords: Equilibrium states, random dynamical systems, Markov partitions, contractive Markov systems, Markov operators.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Definitions and notation **4**

3 Results **5**

3.1 Equilibrium states 7
  3.1.1 Thermodynamic equilibrium states 7
3.2 Uniformly continuous Markov system 10
  3.2.1 The non-degeneracy condition 14
  3.2.2 A sufficient condition for the non-degeneracy 18
  3.2.3 The consistency condition 19
  3.2.4 The dominating Markov chain 21
3.3 Contractive uniformly continuous Markov system 22
  3.3.1 Main theorem 24
  3.3.2 Invariant measures 32

4 Examples and applications **34**

1 Introduction

The purpose of this note is to show the existence of invariant measures for some random dynamical systems introduced in [13] as *contractive Markov systems*. To avoid some confusion, let us stress that the word 'Markov' in the name was used to indicate a Markovian topological structure of the random dynamical system, which naturally generalizes a weighted directed graph, but the dependence structure of random processes which can be generated by it on a code space, in contrast to directed graphs, can be far beyond Markovian. They certainly can generate any stationary process with values in a discrete state space. At the same time, the algorithm for generating a process by such a system is not much different to that for generating a process by a weighted directed graph. Such random dynamical systems find more and more applications in modern sciences, e.g. [9], [1], [4], and provide new challenging and illuminating examples for mathematical theories, e.g. [15], [16], [17]. However, in contrast to weighted directed graphs, the behaviour of contractive Markov systems is still not fully understood.

The existence of stationary states for such systems was shown on some locally compact spaces in [13]. This was proved under the condition that the partition of the Markov system consists of open sets. Though, this was sufficient to cover finite *Markov chains* and *g-measures* [7] with the theory, it clearly poses a severe restriction on the applicability of it. In particular, the removal of the condition admits the usage of *Markov partitions* for random dynamical systems, which reduce the latter to Markov systems, the behaviour of which is more transparent [18]. The proof which was given in [13] went along the lines of that which had been given by M. Barnsley et al. for *iterated function systems with place-dependent probabilities* [2]. The result then was extended by K. Horbacz and T. Szarek [5] on Polish spaces, through application of some results which had been obtained by the second author for Markov operators satisfying some *non-expansiveness* and *concentration* conditions on Polish spaces, using a *lower bound technique* [10]. Unfortunately, the condition of the openness of the partition has been left in place.

In this article, we close the gap by introducing a *non-degeneracy* and a *consistency* conditions and providing further sufficient conditions for them. These conditions admit some proper Markov partitions of connected spaces and allow us to prove the existence of invariant measures for the random dynamical systems which exhibit the continuity and the contraction on average properties only on the atoms of their Markov partitions. In particular, the consistency condition includes all uniformly continuous Markov systems which are obtained from random dynamical systems with continuous maps and probability functions and have a *dominating Markov chain.*

The presented proof is self-contained, does not require any special knowledge and works for countable Markov systems. Moreover, it is shown that the separability of the space is not needed in this case. The existence of the invariant measures is deduced from the existence of *equilibrium states* on the code space associated with such a system, via a *coding map.* This method is easier because the code space is either a compact metrizable space, as in the case with finitely many maps, or can be easily extended to such a space in the case of countably many maps. This allows to take advantage of the weak-star compactness of the set of all Borel probability measures on it.

The existence of the equilibrium states for *energy functions* associated with such systems has been already shown in [15], but it has been deduced from the existence of the invariant measures for such systems with the open partition on locally compact spaces. The main message of [15] was that the current thermodynamic formalism is not applicable to such systems because it fails even to predict the existence of equilibrium states for such energy functions, not to mention the construction of them.

Recently, a construction of such equilibrium states has been proposed in [16] and [17]. It requires the existence of an equilibrium state for such a system for the proof that the constructed measure is not zero.

An other related existence result is a recent proof in the particular case of g-measures by A. Johansson et al. [6]. However, it does not intersect much with the present result as the g-functions associated with our systems are not continuous, even in the case of the openness of the Markov partition (see [15]) or the case of contractive maps on a compact metric space, but without the openness condition on the Markov partition (e.g. see Example 6 below).

The present result also establishes a bijection between the equilibrium states and the invariant Borel probability measures of such systems in the non-degenerate case. In particular, this generalizes a theorem by F. Ledrappier [8], Theorem 2.1 in [11].

The article is organized as follows. Section 1 collects all the necessary definitions and notations. Section 2 presents the main results. Finally, Section 3 provides, in particular, some simple examples to which the technique of Markov partitions can be applied. As far as the author is aware, some of the examples have not been accessible by the theory before.

2 Definitions and notation

Let $\mathcal{B}(X)$ denote Borel σ-algebra on a topological space X and $P(X)$ denote the set of all Borel probability measures on it. Let $\mathcal{L}^B(X)$ denote the set of all real-valued non-negative Borel measurable functions on X. For $B \in \mathcal{B}(X)$, let $P(B)$ denote the set of all $\nu \in P(X)$ such that $\nu(B) = 1$.

Let (K, d) be a complete metric space. A family $D_R := (K, w_e, p_e)_{e\in E}$ is called a *random dynamical system* on K iff E is at most countable, $w_e : K \longrightarrow K$ and $p_e : K \longrightarrow [0,1]$ are Borel-measurable for all $e \in E$ such that $\sum_{e\in E} p_e(x) = 1$ for all $x \in K$. w_e's are called *maps* and p_e's are called *probability functions.*

With D_R is associated a *Markov operator* U defined on $\mathcal{L}^B(K)$ by

$$Uf := \sum_{e\in E} p_e f \circ w_e$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$. Let U^* denote its *adjoint operator* acting on $\nu \in P(K)$ by $U^*\nu(f) := \int Uf d\nu$ for all bounded $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$. $\mu \in P(K)$ is called an *invariant measure* for the random dynamical system iff $U^*\mu = \mu$. Observe that, for the definitions of U and U^*, each w_e needs to be defined only on set $\{x \in K |\ p_e(x) > 0\}$, it then can be extended on the whole space arbitrarily.

A random dynamical system is called a *Markov system* iff it has the form $(K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e\in E'}$ where E' is a set such that there exists a partition of K into non-empty Borel subsets $(K_j)_{j\in N}$, $N \subset \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \in N$ (case where the size of N is 1 is not excluded), and a surjective map $i : E' \longrightarrow N$ and $t : E' \longrightarrow N$ such that for every $e \in E'$ there exist Borel measurable $w_e : K_{i(e)} \longrightarrow K_{t(e)}$ and $p_e : K_{i(e)} \longrightarrow [0,1]$ such that there exists $x_e \in K_{i(e)}$ with $p_e(x_e) > 0$, and $\sum_{e\in E', i(e)=j} p_e(y) = 1$ for all $y \in K_j$ and $j \in N$. K_j's are called the *vertex sets* of the Markov system. The Markov system is called *countable* iff N and E are at most countable. Clearly, a countable Markov system defines a random dynamical system on K by extending p_e's on K by zero and w_e's arbitrarily. Such extensions define the actions of the Markov system on functions and measures through operators U and U^* and will be always assumed.

We say that a random dynamical system has a *Markov partition* iff there exists a partition of K into non-empty Borel subsets such that the restrictions of its maps and probability functions on the atoms of the partition (after a possible re-indexation) form a Markov system.

A Markov system $(K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e\in E}$ is called *contractive* with a contraction rate

$0 < a < 1$ iff

$$\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} p_e(x)d(w_e x, w_e y) < ad(x,y) \text{ for all } x,y\in K_j \text{ and } j\in N. \quad (1)$$

We say that a Markov system $(K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e\in E}$ is *(uniformly) continuous* iff maps $(w_e|_{K_{i(e)}})_{e\in E}$ and probability functions $(p_e|_{K_{i(e)}})_{e\in E}$ are (uniformly) continuous, where notation $f|_A$ means the restriction of a function f on a set A.

A sequence $(e_1, ..., e_n)$ of $e_i \in E$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ is called a *path* of the Markov system iff $i(e_{i+1}) = t(e_i)$ for all i. We will denote by $\delta_x \in P(K)$ the Dirac probability measure concentrated at $x \in K$, by $B_\alpha(x)$ the closed ball of radius α and centre x, by 1_A the indicator function of a set A, by $\bar{A}$ the topological closure of a set A and by $\bar{f}$ the continuous extension of a uniformly continuous function f on the closure of the domain of its definition. For a measurable map between measure spaces $f : (X, \mathcal{A}, \mu) \longrightarrow (Y, \mathcal{B})$, $f(\mu)$ will denote the measure on $(Y, \mathcal{B})$ given by $f(\mu)(B) := \mu(f^{-1}(B))$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, and $f^{-1}(\mathcal{B})$ will denote the σ-algebra $\{f^{-1}(B)|\ B \in \mathcal{B}\}$. As usual, $\ll$ will denote the absolute continuity relation for measures.

Let $(X, \mathcal{B}, \Lambda)$ be a probability space and I be an at most countable set. A family $(A_i)_{i\in I} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is called a *partition* of $(X, \mathcal{B}, \Lambda)$ iff its members are pairwise disjoint and $\Lambda(X \setminus \bigcup_{i\in I} A_i) = 0$. For a partition α of $(X, \mathcal{B}, \Lambda)$ and a sub-σ-algebra $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{B}$, $H_\Lambda(\alpha|\mathcal{C})$ will denote the *conditional entropy* of α conditioned on $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to Λ, which is given by

$$H_\Lambda(\alpha|\mathcal{C}) := -\sum_{A\in\alpha} E_\Lambda(1_A|\mathcal{C}) \log E_\Lambda(1_A|\mathcal{C}),$$

with the usual definition $0 \log 0 := 0$, where $E_\Lambda(1_A|\mathcal{C})$ denotes the conditional expectation of indicator function 1_A conditioned on $\mathcal{C}$ with respect to Λ.

3 Results

Let D_R be a random dynamical system on a complete metric space (K, d) which has a Markov partition $(K_j)_{j\in N}$ such that the resulting Markov system $\mathcal{M} := (K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e\in E}$ is countable. Set

$$P(\mathcal{M}) := \{\mu \in P(K)|\ U^*\mu = \mu\}.$$

Let E and N be provided with the discrete topologies. Set $\bar{E} := E \cup \{\infty\}$ endowed with Alexandrov's one-point compactification topology, i.e. the topology consists of all subsets of E and sets of the form $\bar{E} \setminus C$ where $C \subset E$ is finite. Note that the topology has a countable base (the axiom of choice is assumed in this paper). Let $\bar{E}$ be equipped with the Borel σ-algebra. Note that the Borel σ-algebra still consist of all subsets. We can write $D_R = (K, w_e, p_e)_{e\in\bar{E}}$ where

$w_\infty := id$ and $p_\infty := 0$, as such an extension does not change the action of D_R on functions and measures by its operators. Set $i(\infty) := 1$ and $t(\infty) := 1$. Then we also can write $\mathcal{M} = (K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e\in\bar{E}}$ in the above sense. Now, set $\bar{\Sigma} := \{\sigma := (..., \sigma_{-1}, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, ...)|\ \sigma_i \in \bar{E}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ provided with the product topology. Hence $\bar{\Sigma}$ is Hausdorff and, by Tikhonov Theorem, compact. Moreover, the topology of $\bar{\Sigma}$ has a countable base, since $\bar{E}$ does, and it is regular, since $\bar{E}$ is, and therefore, it is metrizable, by Urysohn's Metrization Theorem. $\bar{\Sigma}$ is called the *code space* of the Markov system. Note that, since the topology of $\bar{E}$ has a countable base, the Borel σ-algebra on $\bar{\Sigma}$ coincides with the product σ-algebra. Let $S : \bar{\Sigma} \longrightarrow \bar{\Sigma}$ be the *left shift* map given by $(S\sigma)_{i-1} = \sigma_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}$. Let $P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$ denote the space of all shift invariant Borel probability measures on $\bar{\Sigma}$ equipped with the weak-start topology. Recall that, since $\bar{\Sigma}$ has a countable base, the Banach space of all continuous functions on it is separable, and therefore, the weak-star topology on the unit ball of the dual space is metrizable. Furthermore, by Riesz Representation Theorem and Alaoglu Theorem, $P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$ is compact and metrizable in the weak-star topology, as a closed subset of the unit ball.

Let $m \leq n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $e_m, ..., e_n \in \bar{E}$. Set ${}_m[e_m, ..., e_n] := \{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}|\ \sigma_i = e_i$ for all $m \leq i \leq n\}$, it is called a *cylinder set.* Let $\mathcal{A}_m$ denote the σ-algebra generated by cylinder sets of the form ${}_m[e_m, ..., e_n]$, $n \geq m$, and $\mathcal{F}_m \subset \mathcal{A}_m$, $m \leq 0$, denote the σ-algebra generated by the cylinder sets of the form ${}_m[e_m, ..., e_0]$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the σ-algebra generated by $\bigcup_{m\leq 0} \mathcal{F}_m$.

For $x \in K$, let P^m_x denote the probability measure on $\mathcal{A}_m$ given by

$$P^m_x({}_m[e_m, ..., e_n]) := p_{e_m}(x)p_{e_{m+1}}(w_{e_m}x)...p_{e_n}(w_{e_{n-1}} \circ ... \circ w_{e_m}x)$$

for all ${}_m[e_m, ..., e_n] \in \mathcal{A}_m$, $n \geq m$, e.g. by Kolmogorov Consistency Theorem. Observe that $P^m_x = P^0_x \circ S^m$ for all $m \leq 0$, $x \in K$ (here, S^m denotes the naturally induced set map).

Let $\bar{\Sigma}^+ := \{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, ...)|\ \sigma_i \in \bar{E}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ provided with the product topology and the product σ-algebra, and let $\mathcal{B}(K) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+)$ denote the product σ-algebra of the Borel σ-algebra on K and that on $\bar{\Sigma}^+$. Let ${}_m[e_m, ..., e_n]^+ \subset \bar{\Sigma}^+$, $m > 0$, denote a cylinder set. For $x \in K$, let P_x denote the Borel probability measure on $\bar{\Sigma}^+$ given by

$$P_x({}_1[e_1, ..., e_n]) := p_{e_1}(x)p_{e_2}(w_{e_1}x)...p_{e_n}(w_{e_{n-1}} \circ ... \circ w_{e_1}x)$$

for all ${}_1[e_1, ..., e_n] \subset \bar{\Sigma}^+$.

Set

$$\Sigma_G := \left\{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}|\ i(\sigma_{n+1}) = t(\sigma_n),\ \sigma_n \in E \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}\right\}$$

provided with the metric $d'(\sigma, \sigma') := 2^{-k}$ where $k \in \mathbb{N} \cap 0$ is the largest with $\sigma_i = \sigma'_i$ for all $|i| < k$. Observe that the topology on Σ_G which is induced from $\bar{\Sigma}$ coincides with that given by d'.

Remark 1 In the following, often implicitly, the following fact will be used, which might be useful to observe before. For every ${}_m[e_m,...,e_n]\in\mathcal{A}_m$, $x\in K$ and $m\in\mathbb{Z}$, $P^m_x({}_m[e_m,...,e_n])>0$ implies that $(e_m,...,e_n)$ is a *path* of the Markov system and $x\in K_{i(e_m)}$. This follows from the definition that the probability functions are zero outside their vertex sets. Note that, in this paper, they are allowed to be zero also on their vertex sets, whereas in [13] it was required that $p_e|_{K_{i(e)}}>0$ for all $e\in E$. The latter is necessary if one wants to prove that the process started at any $x\in K_i$, for a fixed $i\in N$, converges to the same stationary state [18]. However, in this article, we are concerned only with the question on the existence of the stationary states.

Moreover, observe that, since i is surjective,

$$\sum_{(e_m,...,e_n)\text{ is a path}} P^{m-k}_x({}_m[e_m,...,e_n])=1 \tag{2}$$

for all $x\in K$, $m<n$ and $k\geq 0$.

3.1 Equilibrium states

Now, fix $x_i\in K_i$ for all $i\in N$, and set

$$D:=\left\{\sigma\in\Sigma_G\;\middle|\;\lim_{m\to-\infty}w_{\sigma_0}\circ...\circ w_{\sigma_m}(x_{i(\sigma_m)})\text{ exists}\right\}$$

and

$$F(\sigma):=\begin{cases}\lim\limits_{m\to-\infty}w_{\sigma_0}\circ w_{\sigma_{-1}}\circ...\circ w_{\sigma_m}(x_{i(\sigma_m)}) & \text{if }\sigma\in D\\ x_{t(\sigma_0)} & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

for all $\sigma\in\bar{\Sigma}$. $F:\bar{\Sigma}\longrightarrow K$ is called the *coding map* of the Markov system. Clearly, it is $\mathcal{F}$-Borel-measurable. Furthermore, let $F:P_S(\bar{\Sigma})\longrightarrow P(K)$ be given by $F(\Lambda)(B):=\Lambda(F^{-1}(B))$ for all Borel $B\subset K$ and $\Lambda\in P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$.

Next, set

$$E(\mathcal{M}):=\left\{\Lambda\in P_S(\bar{\Sigma})|\ \Lambda(D)=1\text{ and }E_\Lambda(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F})=p_e\circ F\ \Lambda\text{-a.e. for all }e\in E\right\}.$$

It will be show in Subsection 3.1.1 that the definition of $E(\mathcal{M})$ naturally extends the notion of *equilibrium states* in the thermodynamic sense.

3.1.1 Thermodynamic equilibrium states

Now, we are going to show that the members of $E(\mathcal{M})$ with finite entropy which can be computed according to Kolmogorov-Sinai Theorem are exactly the equilibrium states in the thermodynamic sense, which minimise the *free energy* of the system, for the following energy function. Set

$$u(\sigma) := \begin{cases} \log p_{\sigma_1} \circ F(\sigma) & \text{if } \sigma \in D \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}$ with the definition $\log(0) := -\infty$. u is called the *energy function* of the Markov system.

Definition 1 For $\Lambda \in P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$, set

$$h_S(\Lambda) := H_\Lambda\left(({}_1[e])_{e\in\bar{E}}|\mathcal{F}\right). \tag{3}$$

Recall that, by Kolmogorov-Sinai Theorem, $h_S(\Lambda)$ is *Shannon-Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy* if $-\sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \Lambda\left({}_1[e]\right)\log\Lambda\left({}_1[e]\right) < \infty$. $\Lambda_0 \in P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$ is said to be an *equilibrium state* for u iff $h_S(\Lambda_0) < \infty$ and

$$h_S(\Lambda_0) + \int u d\Lambda_0 = \sup_{\Lambda\in P_S(\bar{\Sigma}),\ h_S(\Lambda)<\infty} \left\{ h_S(\Lambda) + \int u d\Lambda \right\}.$$

Let $E(u) \subset P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$ denote the set of all equilibrium states for u.

The proof of the next lemma is an adaptation of Ledrappier's proof [8].

Lemma 1 *Let* $\Lambda \in P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$ *such that* $h_S(\Lambda) < \infty$. *Then*

$$h_S(\Lambda) + \int u d\Lambda \leq 0, \tag{4}$$

and the equality holds if and only if $\Lambda \in E(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. Let's abbreviate

$$g_e := E_\Lambda\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right)$$

for all $e \in \bar{E}$. If $\int u d\Lambda = -\infty$, then $h_S(\Lambda) + \int u d\Lambda = -\infty < 0$ and (4) holds true. Otherwise, $\Lambda(D) = 1$, and therefore, since $\int_{\{g_e=0\}} 1_{{}_1[e]} \log p_e \circ F d\Lambda = 0$ for all $e \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_S(\Lambda) + \int u d\Lambda &= -\sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int g_e \log g_e d\Lambda + \sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int 1_{{}_1[e]} \log p_e \circ F d\Lambda \\ &= \sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int g_e \log \frac{p_e \circ F}{g_e} d\Lambda \\ &\leq \sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int g_e \left(\frac{p_e \circ F}{g_e} - 1 \right) d\Lambda \\ &= \sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int \left(p_e \circ F - g_e\right) d\Lambda \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Thus (4) holds true in this case also. If (4) is an equality, then $\int u d\Lambda > -\infty$, and therefore, $\Lambda(D) = 1$ and, by (5),

$$\sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int g_e \log \frac{p_e \circ F}{g_e} d\Lambda = \sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int g_e \left(\frac{p_e \circ F}{g_e} - 1 \right) d\Lambda.$$

Hence

$$\log \frac{p_e \circ F(\sigma)}{g_e(\sigma)} = \left(\frac{p_e \circ F(\sigma)}{g_e(\sigma)} - 1 \right) \text{ for } \Lambda\text{-a.e. } \sigma \in \{g_e > 0\}$$

for all $e \in \bar{E}$, but this is possible if and only if

$$g_e(\sigma) = p_e \circ F(\sigma) \text{ for } \Lambda\text{-a.e. } \sigma \in \{g_e > 0\}$$

for all $e \in \bar{E}$. Therefore,

$$E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) \le p_e \circ F \quad \Lambda\text{-a.e.}$$

for all $e \in \bar{E}$. However, as then

$$1 = \sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) d\Lambda \le \sum_{e\in\bar{E}} \int p_e \circ F d\Lambda = 1,$$

it follows that

$$E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) = p_e \circ F \quad \Lambda\text{-a.e.}$$

for all $e \in \bar{E}$. Thus $\Lambda \in E(\mathcal{M})$.

Conversely, if $\Lambda \in E(\mathcal{M})$, then, as $\Lambda({}_1[\infty]) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_S(\Lambda) &= -\sum_{e\in E} \int E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) \log E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) d\Lambda \\ &= -\sum_{e\in E} \sum_{n\le 0} \int\limits_{\left\{ n-1 < \log E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) \le n \right\}} E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) \log E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) d\Lambda \\ &= -\sum_{e\in E} \sum_{n\le 0} \int\limits_{\left\{ n-1 < \log E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) \le n \right\}} 1_{{}_1[e]} \log E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F} \right) d\Lambda \\ &= -\sum_{e\in E} \int\limits_{{}_1[e]} \log p_e \circ F d\Lambda \\ &= -\int u d\Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$h_S(\Lambda) + \int u d\Lambda = 0.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 1 *If* $\{M \in E(\mathcal{M}) |\, h_S(M) < \infty\}$ *is not empty, then* $\{M \in E(\mathcal{M}) |\, h_S(M) < \infty\} = E(u)$.

Proof. By Lemma 1, every member of $\{M \in E(\mathcal{M}) |\, h_S(M) < \infty\}$ is an equilibrium state of u. Conversly, for every $\Lambda_0 \in E(u)$, by the hypothesis and Lemma 1,

$$h_{\Lambda_0}(S) + \int u d\Lambda_0 = 0.$$

Thus, by Lemma 1, $\Lambda_0 \in E(\mathcal{M})$. This completes the proof. □

Theorem 1 and Example 2 from Section 4 seem to indicate that Shannon-Kolmogorov-Sinai entropy might be not the best choice of the entropy for a satisfactory thermodynamic description of such systems.

3.2 Uniformly continuous Markov system

In this subsection, we develop a general theory on the relation of the equilibrium states and the invariant measures of $\mathcal{M}$ if it is uniformly continuous.

Proposition 1 *Suppose* $w_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ *is uniformly continuous for all* $e \in E$. *Then* $F(M) \in P(\mathcal{M})$ *for all* $M \in E(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. Let $M \in E(\mathcal{M})$. Let $\bar{w}_e$ denote the continuous extension of $w_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ on the closure of $K_{i(e)}$ for all $e \in E$. Observe that, as $M(D) = 1$,

$$\bar{w}_{\sigma_1} \circ F(\sigma) = F \circ S(\sigma) \text{ for } M\text{-a.a. } \sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}. \tag{6}$$

Let $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$ be bounded. Then, by the shift invariance of M,

$$\begin{aligned} \int f dU^* F(M) &= \int \sum_{e\in E} p_e f \circ w_e \; dF(M) = \int \sum_{e\in E} p_e f \circ \bar{w}_e \; dF(M) \\ = &\int \sum_{e\in E} p_e \circ F f \circ \bar{w}_e \circ F \; dM = \sum_{e\in E} \int 1_{1[e]} f \circ \bar{w}_e \circ F \; dM \\ = &\sum_{e\in E} \int_{1[e]} f \circ F \circ S \; dM = \int f \; dF(M). \end{aligned}$$

Since f was arbitrary, this completes the proof. □

Now, for $\mu \in P(\mathcal{M})$, set

$$\phi_m(\mu)(A) := \int P_x^m(A) d\mu(x)$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{A}_m$ and $m \leq 0$. Observe that, by the invariance of μ, $\phi_m(\mu)$'s are consistent for all $m \leq 0$ (e.g. see [16]). Let $\Phi(\mu) \in P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$ denote the measure which uniquely extends $\phi_m(\mu)$'s on the Borel σ-algebra, e.g. by Kolmogorov Consistency Theorem. This defines a map $\Phi : P(\mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$.

It is not difficult to check that, for every $\nu \in P(K)$ and $\Omega \in \mathcal{B}(K) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+)$,

$$\tilde{\phi}(\nu)(\Omega) := \int P_x\left(\{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}^+ |\ (x, \sigma) \in \Omega\}\right) d\nu(x)$$

defines a probability measure on $\mathcal{B}(K) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+)$ such that

$$\int f d\tilde{\phi}(\nu) = \int \int f(x, \sigma) dP_x(\sigma) d\nu(x)$$

for every $\tilde{\phi}(\nu)$-integrable function $f : K \times \bar{\Sigma}^+ \longrightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$.

Set

$$\begin{aligned} \pi : \quad & \bar{\Sigma} && \longrightarrow \bar{\Sigma}^+ \\ & (..., \sigma_{-1}, \sigma_0, \sigma_1, ...) && \longmapsto (\sigma_1, \sigma_2 ...) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \eta : \quad & \bar{\Sigma} && \longrightarrow K \times \bar{\Sigma}^+ \\ & \sigma && \longmapsto (F(\sigma), \pi(\sigma)). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2 *Suppose $w_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ is uniformly continuous for all $e \in E$. Let $M \in E(\mathcal{M})$.*
(i) $\Phi(F(M)) = M$.
(ii) $\eta(M) = \tilde{\phi}(F(M))$.
(iii) Let $f_e : K \longrightarrow [-\infty, +\infty]$ be Borel measurable for all $e \in E$ such that $\sum_{e \in E} 1_{1[e]} |f_e| \circ F \in \mathcal{L}^1(M)$. Then there exists $g \in \mathcal{L}^1(\tilde{\phi}(F(M)))$ such that $\int g d\tilde{\phi}(F(M)) = \sum_{e \in E} \int p_e f_e dF(M)$ and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} f_{\sigma_{k+1}} \circ w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x) \to g(x, \sigma)$$

for P_x-a.e. $\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}^+$ and in $\mathcal{L}^1(\tilde{\phi}(F(M)))$ for $F(M)$-a.e. $x \in K$.
(iv) For $F(M)$-a.e $x_0 \in K$, the sequence of probability measures $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ on N given by $\alpha_n(\{j\}) := 1/n \sum_{k=1}^{n} U^{*k} \delta_{x_0}(K_j)$ for all $j \in N$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ converges in total variation.

Proof. (i) Let ${}_1[e_1, ..., e_n] \subset \bar{\Sigma}$ with $(e_1, ..., e_n) \in E$. One easily checks that, by the shift-invariance of M and (6),

$$E_M\left(1_{{}_1[e_1,...,e_n]} | \mathcal{F}\right)(\sigma) = P^1_{F(\sigma)}\left({}_1[e_1, ..., e_n]\right) \qquad \text{for } M\text{-a.e. } \sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}. \tag{7}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(F(M))\left({}_1[e_1,...,e_n]\right) &= \int P_x^1\left({}_1[e_1,...,e_n]\right)dF(M)\\ &= \int P_{F(\sigma)}^1\left({}_1[e_1,...,e_n]\right)dM(\sigma)\\ &= M\left({}_1[e_1,...,e_n]\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the shift-invariants of the measures, they agree on the class of cylinder sets of the form ${}_m[e_m,...,e_{|m|}]$, $m \leq 0$, where $e_m,...,e_{|m|} \in E$. If $e_i = \infty$ for some $m \leq i \leq |m|$, then $\Phi(F(M))({}_m[e_m,...,e_{|m|}]) = 0$ by the definition, and $M({}_m[e_m,...,e_{|m|}]) = 0$, as $M(\bar{\Sigma} \setminus D) = 0$. Thus, the measures agree on the Borel σ-algebra, as the class of cylinder sets of the form ${}_m[e_m,...,e_{|m|}]$, $e_m,...,e_{|m|} \in \bar{E}$, $m \leq 0$, plus empty set, generates the product σ-algebra, is $\cap$-stable and, obviously, $\bigcup_{e\in\bar{E}} {}_0[e] = \bar{\Sigma}$.

(ii) We only need to check that

$$\eta(M)\left(A \times {}_1[e_1,...,e_n]^+\right) = \tilde{\phi}(F(M))\left(A \times {}_1[e_1,...,e_n]^+\right) \tag{8}$$

for all cylinder sets ${}_1[e_1,...,e_n]^+ \subset \bar{\Sigma}^+$ and Borel $A \subset K$. For such sets,

$$\begin{aligned}\eta(M)\left(A \times {}_1[e_1,...,e_n]^+\right) &= M\left(F^{-1}(A) \cap {}_1[e_1,...,e_n]\right)\\ &= \int\limits_{F^{-1}(A)} 1_{{}_1[e_1,...,e_n]}dM,\end{aligned}$$

where ${}_1[e_1,...,e_n] \subset \bar{\Sigma}$ is the pre-image of ${}_1[e_1,...,e_n]^+$ under π. Clearly, both sides of (8) are zero if $e_i = \infty$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Now, let $e_1,...,e_n \in E$. Then, by (7),

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{F^{-1}(A)} 1_{{}_1[e_1,...,e_n]}dM &= \int\limits_{F^{-1}(A)} P_{F(\sigma)}\left({}_1[e_1,...,e_n]^+\right)dM(\sigma)\\ &= \int\limits_{A} P_x\left({}_1[e_1,...,e_n]^+\right)dF(M)(x),\end{aligned}$$

as desired.

(iii) Set $f_\infty := 0$ and $v(\sigma) := f_{\sigma_1}(F(\sigma))$ for all $\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}$. Then,

$$\int |v|dM = \int \sum_{e\in E} 1_{{}_1[e]}|f_e| \circ F dM < \infty.$$

Hence, $v \in \mathcal{L}^1(M)$. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the σ-algebra of all shift-invariant Borel subsets of $\bar{\Sigma}$. Set $\bar{v} := E_M(v|\mathcal{I})$. Then, by Birkhoff's Ergodic Theorem,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} v \circ S^k \to \bar{v} \quad M\text{-a.e. and in } \mathcal{L}^1(M).$$

Since $M(D)=1$ and $F\circ S^k(\sigma)=\bar{w}_{\sigma_k}\circ ...\circ\bar{w}_{\sigma_1}\circ F(\sigma)$ for all $\sigma\in D$ and $k\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} f_{\sigma_{k+1}}\circ\bar{w}_{\sigma_k}\circ ...\circ\bar{w}_{\sigma_1}\circ F(\sigma)\to\bar{v}(\sigma)\quad M\text{-a.e. } \sigma\in\bar{\Sigma}\text{ and in } \mathcal{L}^1(M).$$

Set

$$\bar{f}_n(x,\sigma):=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} f_{\sigma_{k+1}}\circ\bar{w}_{\sigma_k}\circ ...\circ\bar{w}_{\sigma_1}(x)$$

for all $x\in K$, $\sigma\in\bar{\Sigma}^+$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\bar{f}_n\circ\eta(\sigma)\to\bar{v}(\sigma)\quad M\text{-a.e. } \sigma\in\bar{\Sigma}\text{ and in } \mathcal{L}^1(M).$$

Hence, $\bar{v}$ is $\eta^{-1}(\mathcal{B}(K)\otimes\mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+))$-measurable. Therefore, by the Factorisation Lemma, there exists a $\mathcal{B}(K)\otimes\mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+)$-measurable function g such that

$$\bar{v}=g\circ\eta.$$

Then, by (ii) and the definition of $\tilde{\phi}(F(M))$,

$$\bar{f}_n(x,\sigma)\to g(x,\sigma)\quad\text{ for } F(M)\text{-a.e. } x\in K\text{ and } P_x\text{-a.e. } \sigma\in\bar{\Sigma}^+$$

and in $\mathcal{L}^1(\tilde{\phi}(F(M)))$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\int g d\tilde{\phi}(F(M)) &= \int g\circ\eta dM=\int v dM=\sum_{e\in E}\int p_e\circ F f_e\circ F dM\\ &= \sum_{e\in E}\int p_e f_e dF(M).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (iii), as $P_x(\{\sigma\in\bar{\Sigma}^+|\ x\notin K_{i(\sigma_1)}$ or $\exists k\in\mathbb{N}$ s.t. $i(\sigma_{k+1})\neq t(\sigma_k)\})=0$, by Remark 1.

(iv) By Proposition 1, $\mu:=F(M)\in P(\mathcal{M})$. Let $i\in N$. Set $E_i:=\{e\in E|\ i(e)=i\}$ and $f_e=1_{K_i}$ for all $e\in E_i$ and $f_e=0$ for all $e\in E\setminus E_i$. Then, by (iii), there exists $g_i\in\mathcal{L}^1(\tilde{\phi}(\mu))$ such that

$$\int g_i d\tilde{\phi}(\mu)=\sum_{e\in E}\int p_e f_e d\mu=\mu(K_i)\tag{9}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} f_{\sigma_{k+1}}\circ w_{\sigma_k}\circ ...\circ w_{\sigma_1}(x)\to g_i(x,\sigma)\quad\text{ for } P_x\text{-a.e. } \sigma\in\bar{\Sigma}^+\text{ and } \mu\text{-a.e. } x\in K.$$

One readily checks that $\int f_{\sigma_{k+1}}\circ w_{\sigma_k}\circ ...\circ w_{\sigma_1}(x)dP_x(\sigma)=U^k(1_{K_i})(x)$ for all $x\in K$. Hence, by Lebesque's Dominated Convergence Theorem,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} U^k(1_{K_i})(x)\to\int g_i(x,\sigma)dP_x(\sigma)\quad\text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x\in K$$

for all $i \in N$. As N is countable, also for μ-a.e. $x \in K$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} U^k(1_{K_i})(x) \to \int g_i(x,\sigma)dP_x(\sigma) \qquad \text{for all } i \in N.$$

Hence, by Fatou Lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in N}\int g_i(x,\sigma)dP_x(\sigma) &= \sum_{i\in N}\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}U^k(1_{K_i})(x)\\ &\le \liminf_{n\to\infty}\sum_{i\in N}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}U^k(1_{K_i})(x)\\ &= 1 \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x\in K.\end{aligned}$$

Since, by (9), $\int\sum_{i\in N}\int g_i(x,\sigma)dP_x(\sigma)d\mu(x) = \sum_{i\in N}\mu(K_i) = 1$, there exists a Borel $H \subset K$ with $\mu(H) = 1$ such that for every $x_0 \in H$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\alpha_n(\{j\}) = \alpha(\{j\}) \qquad \text{for all } j \in N$$

where α is the probability measure on N given by $\alpha(\{j\}) := \int g_j(x_0,\sigma)dP_{x_0}(\sigma)$ for all $j \in N$. Let $x_0 \in H$. Choose a finite $V_\epsilon \subset N$ such that $\alpha(V_\epsilon) > 1-\epsilon/3$. Then there exist $S \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha_n(V_\epsilon) > 1-\epsilon/3$ for all $n \ge S$ and finite $V_i \subset N$ such that $\alpha_i(V_i) > 1-\epsilon/3$ for all $1 \le i < S$. Set $V'_\epsilon := V_\epsilon \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^{S-1} V_i$. Then $\alpha_n(V'_\epsilon) > 1-\epsilon/3$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, choose $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sum_{j\in V'_\epsilon}|\alpha_n(\{j\}) - \alpha(\{j\})| < \epsilon/4$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Let $A \subset N$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}|\alpha_n(A)-\alpha(A)| &\le |\alpha_n(A\cap V'_\epsilon)-\alpha(A\cap V'_\epsilon)| + \alpha_n(N\setminus V'_\epsilon) + \alpha(N\setminus V'_\epsilon)\\ &< \sum_{j\in V'_\epsilon}|\alpha_n(\{j\})-\alpha(\{j\})| + \frac{2\epsilon}{3}\\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{4}+\frac{2\epsilon}{3}\end{aligned}$$

for all $n \ge n_0$. Thus $\sup_{A\subset N}|\alpha_n(A)-\alpha(A)| < \epsilon$ for all $n \ge n_0$. □

3.2.1 The non-degeneracy condition

Definition 2 Set $T_j := \{\sigma \in \Sigma_G |\ t(\sigma_0) = j\}$ for all $j \in N$. Then, obviously, $T_j \cap T_{j'} = \emptyset$ for all $j \ne j'$ and $\bigcup_{j\in N} T_j = \Sigma_G$. Suppose $p_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ is uniformly continuous for all $e \in E$. For each $e \in E$, let $\bar{p}_e$ denote the continuous extension of $p_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ on $\bar{K}_{i(e)}$ which is extended further on K by zero. Let $\tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$ denote the set

$$\left\{\Lambda \in P_S(\bar{\Sigma}) |\ \Lambda(D) = 1 \text{ and } E_\Lambda(1_{1[e]}|\mathcal{F}) = \bar{p}_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}}\ \Lambda\text{-a.e. for all } e \in E\right\}.$$

We call $\mathcal{M}$ *non-degenerate* if and only if for every $\Lambda \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$ there exists $i \in N$ such that $\Lambda(T_i \cap F^{-1}(K_i)) > 0$. (For example, every uniformly continuous

Markov system with an open partition is non-degenerate, as $T_i \subset F^{-1}(\bar{K}_i)$ for all $i \in N$.) Set $G := \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i\in N} S^{-k}(F^{-1}(K_i) \cap T_i)$. Then obviously, $\mathcal{M}$ is non-degenerate if and only if $M(G) > 0$ for all $M \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$. For $M \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$, set

$$M_G(B) := \begin{cases} \frac{M(B\cap G)}{M(G)} & \text{if } M(G) > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } B \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}).$$

Then, clearly, $M_G \in P_S(\bar{\Sigma}) \cup \{0\}$, as $S^{-1}G \subset G$. Set $\partial p_e := \bar{p}_e 1_{\bar{K}_{i(e)} \setminus K_{i(e)}}$ for all $e \in E$, and let $E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$ denote the set

$$\left\{\Lambda \in P_S\left(\bar{\Sigma}\right) \,\middle|\, \Lambda(D) = 1 \text{ and } E_\Lambda\left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F}\right) = \partial p_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} \ \Lambda\text{-a.e. for all } \ e \in E\right\}.$$

Lemma 3 *(i) Let $\Lambda \in E(\mathcal{M})$. Then $\Lambda(G) = 1$.*
(ii) Suppose $p_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ is uniformly continuous for all $e \in E$. Then $\Lambda(G) = 0$ for all $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. (i) Let $i \in N$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Then, since $\Lambda(\Sigma_G) = 1$,

$$\Lambda\left(A \cap T_i\right) = \sum_{e\in E, i(e)=i} \int_A 1_{{}_1[e]} d\Lambda = \sum_{e\in E, i(e)=i} \int_A p_e \circ F d\Lambda = \Lambda\left(A \cap F^{-1}(K_i)\right).$$

Hence, $\Lambda(T_i) = \Lambda(F^{-1}(K_i))$ and $\Lambda(F^{-1}(K_i) \cap T_i) = \Lambda(F^{-1}(K_i))$ for all $i \in N$. Therefore,

$$\Lambda(G) \geq \Lambda\left(\bigcup_{i\in N} F^{-1}(K_i) \cap T_i\right) = \sum_{i\in N} \Lambda\left(F^{-1}(K_i)\right) = 1.$$

(ii) Let $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$, $i \in N$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$. First, observe that, by Fatou Lemma,

$$\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=i} \bar{p}_e \leq 1_{\bar{K}_i}.$$

Therefore, since $\Lambda(\Sigma_G) = 1$ and $T_i \subset F^{-1}(\bar{K}_i)$,

$$\Lambda\left(A \cap T_i\right) = \sum_{e\in E, i(e)=i} \int_A \bar{p}_e \circ F 1_{\bar{K}_i \setminus K_i} \circ F 1_{T_i} d\Lambda \leq \int_A 1_{T_i \setminus F^{-1}(K_i)} d\Lambda.$$

Hence $\Lambda(F^{-1}(K_i) \cap T_i) = 0$, and therefore,

$$\Lambda(G) \leq \sum_{i\in N, k\geq 0} \Lambda\left(S^{-k}\left(F^{-1}(K_i) \cap T_i\right)\right) = 0.$$

□

Lemma 4 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous. Let $M \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$.*
(i) If $M(G) > 0$, then $M_G \in E(\mathcal{M})$.
(ii) $E(\mathcal{M}) \subset \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$.
(iii) There exist $\Lambda \in E(\mathcal{M}) \cup 0$ and $\Lambda_\perp \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M}) \cup 0$ such that

$$M = M(G)\Lambda + (1 - M(G))\Lambda_\perp.$$

The decomposition is unique if $0 < M(G) < 1$. (Then, by Lemma 3, $\Lambda = M_G$, and $\Lambda_\perp$ is singular to Λ.)
(iv) $E_\perp(\mathcal{M}) \subset \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. (i) Clearly, $M_G \ll M$. Hence, $M_G(D) = 1$. Let $e \in E$. It is a well known fact and it can be easily checked that the absolute continuity relation and the shift-invariance of the measures imply (the shift-invariance of the Radon-Nikodym derivative which in turn implies) that $E_M\left(1_{_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right) = E_{M_G}\left(1_{_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right)$ M_G-a.e.. Hence,

$$E_{M_G}\left(1_{_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right)(\sigma) = \bar{p}_e \circ F(\sigma) 1_{K_{i(e)}}\left(x_{t(\sigma_0)}\right) \qquad \text{for } M_G\text{-a.a. } \sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}.$$

Let $\sigma \in G \cap D$. Then there exist $k \geq 0$ and $j \in N$ such that $S^k(\sigma) \in F^{-1}(K_j) \cap T_j$. That is $F \circ S^k(\sigma) \in K_j$ and $i(\sigma_{k+1}) = t(\sigma_k) = j$. Hence, $F \circ S^n(\sigma) = \bar{w}_{\sigma_n} \circ ... \circ \bar{w}_{\sigma_{k+1}}(F \circ S^k(\sigma)) = w_{\sigma_n} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_{k+1}}(F \circ S^k(\sigma))$ for all $n \geq k$, and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{p}_e \circ F \circ S^n(\sigma) 1_{T_{i(e)}} \circ S^n(\sigma) &= \bar{p}_e \circ w_{\sigma_n} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_{k+1}}\left(F \circ S^k(\sigma)\right) 1_{K_{i(e)}}\left(x_{t(\sigma_n)}\right) \\ &= p_e \circ w_{\sigma_n} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_{k+1}}\left(F \circ S^k(\sigma)\right) \\ &= p_e \circ F \circ S^n(\sigma) \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq k$. Let $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\bar{p}_e \circ F \circ S^i(\sigma) 1_{T_{i(e)}} \circ S^i(\sigma) 1_A \circ S^i(\sigma) - p_e \circ F \circ S^i(\sigma) 1_A \circ S^i(\sigma)\right) \to 0 \tag{10}$$

for all $\sigma \in G \cap D$. By Birkhoff's Ergodic Theorem, there exist $\bar{v}_e, v_e \in \mathcal{L}^1(M_G)$ such that $\int_A \bar{p}_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} dM_G = \int \bar{v}_e dM_G$, $\int_A p_e \circ F dM_G = \int v_e dM_G$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \bar{p}_e \circ F \circ S^i 1_{T_{i(e)}} \circ S^i 1_A \circ S^i \to \bar{v}_e \text{ and } \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_e \circ F \circ S^i 1_A \circ S^i \to v_e$$

both M_G-a.e.. Hence, since $M_G(G \cap D) = 1$, $\bar{v}_e = v_e$ M_G-a.e., and therefore,

$$\int_A \bar{p}_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} dM_G = \int_A p_e \circ F dM_G.$$

Thus

$$E_{M_G}\left(1_{_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right) = p_e \circ F \quad M_G\text{-a.e..}$$

This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) Let $\Lambda \in E(\mathcal{M})$. Then, by Lemma 3(i), $\Lambda(G \cap D) = 1$. Therefore, by (10), the same way as above,

$$\int\limits_A 1_{{}_1[e]} d\Lambda = \int\limits_A p \circ F d\Lambda = \int\limits_A \bar{p} \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} d\Lambda$$

for all $e \in E$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Thus $\Lambda \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$. This completes the proof of (ii).

(iii) By (i), we can assume that $M(G) < 1$. Set

$$\Lambda_\perp(B) := \frac{M\left(B \cap \bar{\Sigma} \setminus G\right)}{M\left(\bar{\Sigma} \setminus G\right)}$$

for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma})$. Then $\Lambda_\perp \in P_S(\bar{\Sigma})$, since $S^{-1}G \subset G$, and

$$M = M(G) M_G + (1 - M(G)) \Lambda_\perp.$$

By (i), $M_G \in E(\mathcal{M})$. Note that $\Lambda_\perp \ll M$. Let $e \in E$. Then, $\Lambda_\perp(D) = 1$, and, as in the proof of (i),

$$E_{\Lambda_\perp}\left(1_{{}_1[e]} | \mathcal{F}\right) = \bar{p}_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} \quad \Lambda_\perp\text{-a.e. }.$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{F}$. By Birkhoff's Ergodic Theorem, there exist $\bar{v}_e, \partial v_e \in \mathcal{L}^1(\Lambda_\perp)$ such that $\int \bar{v}_e d\Lambda_\perp = \int_A \bar{p}_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} d\Lambda_\perp$ and $\int \partial v_e d\Lambda_\perp = \int_A \partial p_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} d\Lambda_\perp$ and

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \bar{p}_e \circ F \circ S^k 1_{T_{i(e)}} \circ S^i 1_A \circ S^k \to \bar{v}_e \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \partial p_e \circ F \circ S^k 1_A \circ S^k \to \partial v_e$$

both $\Lambda_\perp$-a.e.. Note that $\bar{p}_e = p_e + \partial p_e$. Therefore,

$$\bar{p}_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} = p_e \circ F 1_{F^{-1}\left(K_{i(e)}\right) \cap T_{i(e)}} + \partial p_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}}.$$

Let $\sigma \in D \cap \bar{\Sigma} \setminus G$. Then for each $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $i \in N$, $S^k(\sigma) \in \bar{\Sigma} \setminus (F^{-1}(K_i) \cap T_i)$. Hence,

$$\bar{p}_e \circ F \circ S^k(\sigma) 1_{T_{i(e)}} \circ S^k(\sigma) = \partial p_e \circ F \circ S^k(\sigma) 1_{T_{i(e)}} \circ S^k(\sigma) \tag{11}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, since $\Lambda_\perp(D \cap \bar{\Sigma} \setminus G) = 1$, $\bar{v}_e = \partial v_e$ $\Lambda_\perp$-a.e., and

$$\int\limits_A \bar{p}_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} d\Lambda_\perp = \int\limits_A \partial p_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} d\Lambda_\perp.$$

Thus $\Lambda_\perp \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$, and the existence of the decomposition is proved.

Suppose $0 < M(G) < 1$, and there exit $\Lambda' \in E(\mathcal{M})$ and $\Lambda'_\perp \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$ such that

$$M = M(G) \Lambda' + (1 - M(G)) \Lambda'_\perp.$$

Then, by Lemma 3(i), $\Lambda'(G) = 1$. Hence $\Lambda'_\perp(G) = 0$. Therefore, $M(B \cap G) = M(G)\Lambda'(B)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma})$. That is $\Lambda' = M_G$. Hence, $\Lambda'_\perp = (M - M(G)M_G)/(1 - M(G)) = \Lambda_\perp$. Thus, the decomposition is unique.

(iv) Let $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$, $e \in E$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Then, by Lemma 3(ii), $\Lambda(D \cap \bar{\Sigma} \backslash G) = 1$. Hence, by (11), the same way as above,

$$\int_A 1_{1[e]} d\Lambda = \int_A \partial p_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} d\Lambda = \int_A \bar{p} \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} d\Lambda.$$

Thus $\Lambda \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$. □

Theorem 2 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous. Then the following are equivalent.*
(i) $\mathcal{M}$ is non-degenerate.
(ii) $M(G) > 0$ for all $M \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$.
(iii) $E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$ is empty.
(iv) $\tilde{E}(\mathcal{M}) = E(\mathcal{M})$.
(v) $M(G) = 1$ for all $M \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. $(i) \Leftrightarrow (ii)$ is obvious.

$(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$ follows by Lemma 4 (iv) and Lemma 3 (ii).

$(iii) \Rightarrow (iv)$ follows by Lemma 4 (ii) and (iii).

$(iv) \Rightarrow (v)$ follows by Lemma 3 (i).

$(v) \Rightarrow (ii)$ is obvious. □

3.2.2 A sufficient condition for the non-degeneracy

The following lemma will be used to show the non-degeneracy of most of the examples in this article.

Definition 3 Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous. Set

$$Rf := \sum_{e \in E} \partial p_e f \circ \bar{w}_e$$

for all Borel-measurable $f : K \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$, and

$$\Omega := \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \{R^n 1 \geq 1\}.$$

Clearly, if the partition of $\mathcal{M}$ consists of open sets, then $R1 = 0$, and therefore $\Omega = \emptyset$. Note that, by Fatou Lemma,

$$R1 = \sum_{e \in E} \partial p_e = \sum_{j \in N} \sum_{e \in E, i(e) = j} \bar{p}_e 1_{\bar{K}_j \backslash K_j} \leq \sum_{j \in N} 1_{\bar{K}_j \backslash K_j}.$$

Therefore, $\Omega \subset \bigcup_{j\in N} \bar{K}_j \setminus K_j$.

Lemma 5 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous. Let $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$. Then*

$$F(\Lambda)(\Omega) = 1.$$

Proof. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the shift-invariance of Λ and (6), one easily checks that, for all $e_1, ..., e_n \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} & E_\Lambda \left(1_{{}_1[e_1,...,e_n]} | \mathcal{F}\right) \\ = \; & 1_{K_{i(e_2)}}(x_{t(e_1)})...1_{K_{i(e_n)}}(x_{t(e_{n-1})}) \\ & \times \partial p_{e_1} \circ F 1_{T_{i(e_1)}} \partial p_{e_2} \circ \bar{w}_{e_1} \circ F ... \partial p_{e_n} \circ \bar{w}_{e_{n-1}} \circ ... \circ \bar{w}_{e_1} \circ F \quad \Lambda\text{-a.e..} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every $B \in \mathcal{B}(K)$,

$$\begin{aligned} F(\Lambda)(B) &= \sum_{e_1,...,e_n \in E} \int\limits_{F^{-1}(B)} 1_{{}_1[e_1,...,e_n]} d\Lambda \le \int\limits_{F^{-1}(B)} (R^n 1) \circ F d\Lambda \\ &= \int\limits_B R^n 1 dF(\Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

That is $1 \le R^n 1$ $F(\Lambda)$-a.e.. The assertion follows. □

Lemma 6 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is non-degenerate if $F^{-1}(\Omega)$ is empty.*

Proof. The assertion follows immediately from Lemma 5 and Theorem 2. □

3.2.3 The consistency condition

Example 4 (below) shows that the non-degeneracy is not a necessary condition for the existences of an invariant measure for a finite uniformly continuous contractive Markov system. The following theorem can be used in the degenerate case.

Definition 4 Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous. We call $\mathcal{M}$ *consistent* if and only if $F(M) \in P(\mathcal{M})$ for all $M \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$. By Theorem 2 and Proposition 1, every uniformly continuous non-degenerate Markov system is consistent.

Condition 1 *$\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous and*

$$(Rf) \circ F(\sigma) \le (Uf) \circ F(\sigma) \text{ for all } \sigma \in F^{-1}(\Omega)$$

and all bounded $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$.

Obviously, the condition is satisfied if $F^{-1}(\Omega)$ is empty, which, by Lemma 6, implies the non-degeneracy. In general, it implies the consistency, as the next theorem shows. However, it is not a necessary condition for it (see Example 4).

Theorem 3 *(i) $\mathcal{M}$ is consistent if and only if $F(\Lambda) \in P(\mathcal{M})$ for all $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$.*
(ii) $\mathcal{M}$ is consistent if it satisfies Condition 1.

Proof. (i) The 'only if' part follows by Lemma 4 (iv). For 'if' part, let $M \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$ such that $M = M(G)M_G + (1 - M(G))\Lambda$, by Lemma 4 (iii). Then $F(M) = M(G)F(M_G) + (1 - M(G))F(\Lambda)$. Hence, by Lemma 4(i) and Proposition 1, $F(\Lambda) \in P(\mathcal{M})$.

(ii) Let $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$ be bounded. Then, by the hypothesis and Lemma 5,

$$\begin{aligned} \int f dF(\Lambda) &= \sum_{e \in E} \int 1_{{}_0[e]} f \circ F d\Lambda = \sum_{e \in E} \int 1_{{}_1[e]} f \circ \bar{w}_e \circ F d\Lambda \\ &= \sum_{e \in E} \int \partial p_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} f \circ \bar{w}_e \circ F d\Lambda \leq \int (Rf) \circ F d\Lambda \leq \int U f dF(\Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\int f dF(\Lambda) \leq \int f dU^*(F(\Lambda)).$$

Since f was arbitrary, it follows that $F(\Lambda) \in P(\mathcal{M})$. □

Lemma 7 *Suppose $\mathcal{D}_R$ is continuous, and $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous.*
(i) Let $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$ be bounded. Then

$$Rf \leq \left(\sum_{i \in N} 1_{\bar{K}_i \setminus K_i} \right) U f.$$

(ii) $\mathcal{M}$ is consistent if $\sum_{i \in N} 1_{\bar{K}_i \setminus K_i}(F(\sigma)) \leq 1$ for all $\sigma \in F^{-1}(\Omega)$.

Proof. (i) Let $\mathcal{D}_R = (K, w'_e, p'_e)_{e \in E'}$ with $w'_e : K \longrightarrow K$ and $p'_e : K \longrightarrow [0,1]$ both uniformly continuous for all $e \in E'$ and $c : E \longrightarrow E'$ be given by $w'_{c(e)}|_{K_{i(e)}} = w_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ and $w'_{c(e)}|_{K_{i(e)}} = w_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ for all $e \in E$. Note that, for each $j \in N$,

$$\sum_{e_0 \in E, i(e_0) = j} \sum_{e \in c^{-1}(\{c(e_0)\})} p_e f \circ w_e \leq U f.$$

Furthermore, by the continuity of $\mathcal{D}_R$, for each $e_0 \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial p_{e_0} &= \bar{p}_{e_0} 1_{\bar{K}_{i(e_0)} \setminus K_{i(e_0)}} = 1_{\bar{K}_{i(e_0)} \setminus K_{i(e_0)}} p'_{c(e_0)} \\ &= 1_{\bar{K}_{i(e_0)} \setminus K_{i(e_0)}} \sum_{e \in c^{-1}(\{c(e_0)\})} p_e 1_{K_{i(e)}}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\bar{w}_{e_0}|_{K_{i(e)}\cap\bar{K}_{i(e_0)}} = w'_{c(e_0)}|_{K_{i(e)}\cap\bar{K}_{i(e_0)}} = w_e|_{K_{i(e)}\cap\bar{K}_{i(e_0)}}$ for all $e \in c^{-1}(\{c(e_0)\})$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Rf &= \sum_{e_0\in E} \partial p_{e_0} f \circ \bar{w}_{e_0} \\ &= \sum_{j\in N} \sum_{e_0\in E, i(e_0)=j} 1_{\bar{K}_j\setminus K_j} \sum_{e\in c^{-1}(\{c(e_0)\})} p_e 1_{K_{i(e)}} f \circ \bar{w}_{e_0} \\ &= \sum_{j\in N} 1_{\bar{K}_j\setminus K_j} \sum_{e_0\in E, i(e_0)=j} \sum_{e\in c^{-1}(\{c(e_0)\})} p_e 1_{K_{i(e)}} f \circ w_e \\ &\leq \sum_{j\in N} 1_{\bar{K}_j\setminus K_j} Uf. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) The assertion follows immediately from (i) and the hypothesis. □

3.2.4 The dominating Markov chain

Definition 5 We say that $\mathcal{M}$ has a *dominating* Markov chain iff there exits $0 < \xi < \infty$ such that

$$\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=i} \sup_{x\in K_i} p_e(x) \leq \xi \text{ for all } i \in N. \tag{12}$$

In this case, set

$$q_{ij} := \frac{\sum\limits_{e\in E, i(e)=i, t(e)=j} \sup\limits_{x\in K_i} p_e(x)}{\sum\limits_{e\in E, i(e)=i} \sup\limits_{x\in K_i} p_e(x)}$$

for all for all $i, j \in N$ and

$$c := \sum_{j\in N} \sup_{i\in N} q_{ij}. \tag{13}$$

Lemma 8 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ has a dominating Markov chain and each $p_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ is uniformly continuous. Let $j \in N$. Then*

$$\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} \bar{p}_e(x) = 1_{\bar{K}_j}(x) \quad \textit{for all } x \in K.$$

Proof. Let $x \in K$. If $x \notin \bar{K}_j$, then, clearly, $\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} \bar{p}_e(x) = 0$. Otherwise, there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset K_j$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = x$. Clearly, $\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} \bar{p}_e(x_n) = \sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} p_e(x_n) = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\lim_{n\to\infty} p_e(x_n) = \bar{p}_e(x)$ for all $e \in E$ with $i(e) = j$, and $\mathcal{M}$ has a dominating Markov chain, it follows, by Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, that

$$\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} \bar{p}_e(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} p_e(x_n) = 1.$$

Thus, combining both cases, $\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} \bar{p}_e(x) = 1_{\bar{K}_j}(x)$. □

Theorem 4 *Suppose $\mathcal{D}_R$ is continuous, and $\mathcal{M}$ is uniformly continuous and has a dominating Markov chain. Then $\mathcal{M}$ is consistent.*

Proof. Let $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$ and $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$ be bounded. Let $\mathcal{D}_R = (K, w'_{e'}, p'_{e'})_{e'\in E'}$ where $w'_{e'} : K \longrightarrow K$ and $p'_{e'} : K \longrightarrow [0,1]$ both uniformly continuous for all $e' \in E'$ and $c : E \longrightarrow E'$ be given by $w'_{c(e)}|_{K_{i(e)}} = w_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ and $w'_{c(e)}|_{K_{i(e)}} = w_e|_{K_{i(e)}}$ for all $e \in E$. Then, by the continuity of $\mathcal{D}_R$, for each $e \in E$, $\partial p_e = \bar{p}_e 1_{\bar{K}_{i(e)}\setminus K_{i(e)}} = 1_{\bar{K}_{i(e)}\setminus K_{i(e)}} p'_{c(e)}$ and $\bar{w}_e|_{\bar{K}_{i(e)}} = w'_{c(e)}|_{\bar{K}_{i(e)}}$. Note that, by Lemma 8, $\sum_{e\in E, i(e)=j} \partial p_e = 1_{\bar{K}_j\setminus K_j}$ for all $j \in N$. Therefore, as in the proof of Theorem 3 (ii),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int f dF(\Lambda) \\
= & \sum_{e\in E} \int \partial p_e \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} f \circ \bar{w}_e \circ F d\Lambda \\
= & \sum_{e\in E} \int 1_{\bar{K}_{i(e)}\setminus K_{i(e)}} \circ F p'_{c(e)} \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} f \circ w'_{c(e)} \circ F d\Lambda \\
= & \sum_{e'\in E'} \sum_{e\in E, c(e)=e'} \int p'_{e'} \circ F f \circ w'_{e'} \circ F 1_{\bar{K}_{i(e)}\setminus K_{i(e)}} \circ F 1_{T_{i(e)}} d\Lambda \\
= & \sum_{e'\in E'} \sum_{e\in E, c(e)=e'} \sum_{e_0\in E, i(e_0)=i(e)} \int p'_{e'} \circ F f \circ w'_{e'} \circ F \partial p_{e_0} \circ F 1_{T_{i(e_0)}} d\Lambda \\
= & \sum_{e'\in E'} \sum_{e\in E, c(e)=e'} \sum_{e_0\in E, i(e_0)=i(e)} \int p'_{e'} \circ F f \circ w'_{e'} \circ F 1_{{}_1[e_0]} d\Lambda \\
\leq & \sum_{e'\in E'} \int p'_{e'} \circ F f \circ w'_{e'} \circ F d\Lambda \\
= & \int U f dF(\Lambda).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, $\int f dF(\Lambda) \leq \int f dU^* F(\Lambda)$. Since f was arbitrary, the assertion follows by Theorem 3 (i). □

3.3 Contractive uniformly continuous Markov system

In this subsection, we are going to apply the theory developed so far to the case when $\mathcal{M}$ is contractive.

Now, set

$$L(x) := \sum_{j\in N} d(x, x_j) 1_{K_j}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in K,$$

$$b := \sup_{i\in N}\sup_{x\in K_i}\sum_{e\in E,\ i(e)=i} p_e(x) d\left(w_e(x_{i(e)}), x_{t(e)}\right), \tag{14}$$

$$C(x) := L(x) + \frac{b}{1-a} \quad \text{for all } x \in K,$$

where $0 < a < 1$ is a contraction rate of the Markov system, and let's abbreviate $X_m(\sigma) := w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_m}(x_{i(\sigma_m)})$ for all $\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}$.

Lemma 9 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is contractive with a contraction rate $0 < a < 1$.*
(i) $UL \leq aL + b$.
(ii)

$$U^n L \leq a^n L + \frac{b}{1-a} \quad \textit{for all } n \geq 0. \tag{15}$$

(iii) For every $x \in K$, $m \leq 0$ and $n \geq 0$,

$$\int d\left(X_m(\sigma), w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_{m-n}}(x)\right) dP_x^{m-n}(\sigma) \leq a^{-m+1} C(x) \tag{16}$$

and

$$\int d\left(X_m, X_{m-1}\right) dP_x^{m-n} \leq a^{-m+1} 2C(x). \tag{17}$$

Proof. (i) Let $x \in K_i$ for some $i \in N$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} UL(x) &= \sum_{e\in E} p_e(x) \sum_{j\in N} d\left(w_e(x), x_j\right) 1_{K_j}(w_e x) \\ &\leq \sum_{e\in E,\ i(e)=i} p_e(x) d(w_e(x), w_e(x_i)) + \sum_{e\in E,\ i(e)=i} p_e(x) d\left(w_e(x_i), x_{t(e)}\right) \\ &\leq aL(x) + b. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) (15) follows immediately from (i).

(iii) Clearly, the inequality is true if $b = \infty$. Now, suppose $b < \infty$. By the contraction condition and (15),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int d\left(X_m(\sigma), w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_m} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_{m-n}}(x)\right) dP_x^{m-n}(\sigma) \\ \leq\ & a^{-m+1} \sum_{e_{m-n},...,e_{m-1}\in E} p_{e_{m-n}}(x) ... p_{e_{m-1}}(w_{e_{m-2}} \circ ... \circ w_{e_{m-n}} x) \\ & \qquad \times d\left(x_{t(e_{m-1})}, w_{e_{m-1}} \circ ... \circ w_{e_{m-n}}(x)\right) \\ =\ & a^{-m+1} U^{n-1} \left(\sum_{e_{m-1}\in E} p_{e_{m-1}} d\left(x_{t(e_{m-1})}, w_{e_{m-1}}\right) \right)(x) \\ \leq\ & a^{-m+1}\left(b + aU^{n-1}L(x)\right) \\ \leq\ & a^{-m+1} C(x). \end{aligned}$$

This proves (16), and (17) follows by the triangle inequality. □

Lemma 10 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is contractive with a contraction rate $0 < a < 1$. Then*

$$\int L d\mu \leq \frac{b}{1-a} \qquad \textit{for all } \mu \in P(\mathcal{M}).$$

Proof. Let $\mu \in P(\mathcal{M})$. Clearly, the inequality is true if $b = \infty$. Now, suppose $b < \infty$. For $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, set $f \wedge k := \min\{f, k\}$. Observe that $U(f \wedge k) \leq k \wedge U(f)$. Hence, by induction, $U^n(f \wedge k) \leq k \wedge U^n(f)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, by (15),

$$\int L \wedge k d\mu = \int U^n(L \wedge k) d\mu \leq \int k \wedge \left(a^n L + \frac{b}{1-a}\right) d\mu$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, applying Monotone Convergence Theorem two times implies the assertion. $\square$

3.3.1 Main theorem

Condition 2 *There exists $x_0 \in K$ such that the sequence of probability measures $(\alpha_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ on N given by $\alpha_n(\{j\}) := 1/n \sum_{k=1}^n U^{*k}\delta_{x_0}(K_j)$ for all $j \in N$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is uniformly tight.*

Theorem 5 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is contractive with a contraction rate $0 < a < 1$ and uniformly continuous, and $b < \infty$. Then the following holds true.*
(i) $\tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$ is not empty if $\mathcal{M}$ has a dominating Markov chain, and Condition 2 is satisfied.
(ii) $E(\mathcal{M}) \subset \Phi(P(\mathcal{M})) \subset \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$ and $F(\Phi(\mu)) = \mu$ for all $\mu \in P(\mathcal{M})$.
(iii) There exists a sequence of Borel sets $Q_1 \subset Q_2 \subset ... \subset \Sigma_G$ with $\sum_{k\geq n} \Phi(\mu)(\bar{\Sigma} \setminus Q_k) \leq 1/(1-\sqrt{a})a^{n/2}$ for all $\mu \in P(\mathcal{M})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$d(F(\sigma), F(\sigma')) \leq \frac{8b}{(1-\sqrt{a})(1-a)} d'(\sigma, \sigma')^{\frac{\log\sqrt{a}}{\log(1/2)}}$$

whenever $\sigma, \sigma' \in Q_k$ with $d'(\sigma, \sigma') \leq (1/2)^{k+1}$, i.e. $F|_{Q_k}$ is locally Hölder-continuous with the same Hölder-constants for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Set

$$\phi_{m-1}^n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n P_{x_0}^{m-k}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \geq 1$ where x_0 is given by Condition 2. Then each ϕ_m^n is clearly a measure on $\mathcal{A}_m$. Recall that $\bar{\Sigma}^+$ is a compact metrizable space. Clearly, the set of all pre-images of cylinder sets in $\mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+)$ under π is exactly the set of all cylinder sets in $\mathcal{A}_1$. Therefore, since both σ-algebras are generated by their cylinder sets, $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+)) = \mathcal{A}_1$, i.e. the induced set map $\tilde{\pi}^{-1} : \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+) \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_1$

is bijective. Since the set of all Borel probability measures on $\bar{\Sigma}^+$ is sequentially compact in the weakly-star topology, there exists a subsequence $(\pi(\phi_1^{n_k}))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a probability measure ϕ^+ on $\mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+)$ such that $\pi(\phi_1^{n_k})$ converges to ϕ^+ weakly-star as $k \to \infty$. Observe that, by the definition of ϕ_1^n's, ϕ^+ is invariant with respect to the left shift map on $\bar{\Sigma}^+$, as the shift maps commute with π. Set

$$M(\pi^{-1}(B)) := \phi^+(B) \text{ for all } B \in \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Sigma}^+).$$

Then this defines a shift-invariant measure M on $\mathcal{A}_1$. Furthermore, by the shift-invariance of M, this gives consistent measures on $\mathcal{A}_m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, by $M(S^{m-1}A)$, which we will also denote by M. In particular, M defines consistent measures on all finite dimensional sub-σ-algebras of the product σ-algebra on $\bar{\Sigma}$. Let $e_1, ..., e_n \in E$. Observe that the image of ${}_1[e_1, ..., e_n] \subset \bar{\Sigma}$ under π is a cylinder set which is open and closed in $\bar{\Sigma}^+$. Observe that $\phi_m^n = \phi_1^n \circ S^{m-1}$ for all $m \leq 1$ and $n \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{k\to\infty} \phi_m^{n_k}({}_m[e_1, ..., e_n]) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \phi_1^{n_k}\left({}_1[e_1, ..., e_n]\right) \\ = \ & \lim_{k\to\infty} \phi_1^{n_k} \circ \pi^{-1}\left(\pi({}_1[e_1, ..., e_n])\right) = \phi^+\left(\pi({}_1[e_1, ..., e_n])\right) \\ = \ & M({}_m[e_1, ..., e_n]) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for all $m \leq 1$. Furthermore, observe that

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \phi_m^{n_k}(O) \geq M(O) \tag{19}$$

for every open set $O \in \mathcal{A}_m$ and $m \leq -1$, as π is open.

Now, for every $m \leq 0$ and a finite $C \subset E$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{x_0}^{m-k}\left(\bigcup_{e\in\bar{E}\setminus C} {}_m[e]\right) \\ = \ & \sum_{j\in N} \sum_{e\in E\setminus C, i(e)=j} \int p_e \circ w_{\sigma_{m-1}} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_{m-k}}(x_0) P_{x_0}^{m-k}(\sigma) \\ \leq \ & \sum_{j\in N} \sum_{e\in E\setminus C, i(e)=j} \sup_{x\in K_j} p_e(x) \int 1_{K_j} \circ w_{\sigma_{m-1}} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_{m-k}}(x_0) P_{x_0}^{m-k}(\sigma) \\ = \ & \sum_{j\in N} \sum_{e\in E\setminus C, i(e)=j} \sup_{x\in K_j} p_e(x) U^{*k}\delta_{x_0}\left(K_j\right). \end{aligned}$$

By the hypothesis, there exists a finite $V_\epsilon \subset N$ such that $\alpha_n(N \setminus V_\epsilon) < \epsilon/(2\xi)$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where ξ is in Definition 5. Thus, by (19), as $\bigcup_{e\in\bar{E}\setminus C} {}_m[e]$ is open,

$$\begin{aligned}
M\left(\bigcup_{e\in\bar{E}\setminus C} {}_m[e]\right) &\leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \phi_m^{n_k}\left(\bigcup_{e\in\bar{E}\setminus C} {}_m[e]\right) \\
&\leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \sum_{j\in N} \sum_{e\in E\setminus C, i(e)=j} \sup_{x\in K_j} p_e(x)\alpha_{n_k}(\{j\}) \\
&\leq \sum_{j\in V_\epsilon} \sum_{e\in E\setminus C, i(e)=j} \sup_{x\in K_j} p_e(x) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists a finite $C \subset E$ such that

$$M\left(\bigcup_{e\in\bar{E}\setminus C} {}_m[e]\right) \leq \epsilon. \tag{20}$$

This means that each one-dimensional measure M has an *approximating compact class*. Therefore, M extends uniquely to a shift-invariant Borel probability measure on $\bar{\Sigma}$, which we will also denote by M, e.g. by Kolmogorov Consistency Theorem [3]. (As $\bar{E}$ is a Polish space, the existence of a compact approximating class is actually automatic. However,(20) is still needed for the next step.)

Now, set

$$\Omega_\infty := \left\{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma} \mid \text{ there exists } m \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ s.t. } \sigma_m = \infty\right\}.$$

By (20), for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ there exists a finite $C_m \subset E$ such that

$$M\left(\bigcup_{e\in\bar{E}\setminus C_m} {}_m[e]\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} 2^{-|m|}.$$

As $\Omega_\infty \subset \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} \bigcup_{e\in\bar{E}\setminus C_m} {}_m[e]$, it follows that $M(\Omega_\infty) \leq 3/4\epsilon < \epsilon$. Since ϵ was arbitrary, we conclude that

$$M(\Omega_\infty) = 0. \tag{21}$$

Next, we show that Σ_G has the full measure. First, observe that every $\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}\setminus\Sigma_G$ is either in Ω_∞, or there exists $e_1, ..., e_n \in E$ such that $(e_1, ..., e_n)$ is not a path and $\sigma \in {}_m[e_1, ..., e_n]$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Remark 1 and (18), $M({}_m[e_1, ..., e_n]) = 0$. Hence, for every $\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma} \setminus (\Omega_\infty \cup \Sigma_G)$ there exists an open set O_σ such that $\sigma \in O_\sigma$ and $M(O_\sigma) = 0$. Choose open sets $O_\infty \subset \bar{\Sigma}$ and $O_G \subset \bar{\Sigma}$ such that $\Omega_\infty \subset O_\infty$, $\Sigma_G \subset O_G$, $M(O_\infty) < \epsilon/2$ and $M(O_G \setminus \Sigma_G) < \epsilon/2$. Then, by the compactness of $\bar{\Sigma}$, there exist finitely many $\sigma^1, ..., \sigma^k \in \bar{\Sigma} \setminus (\Omega_\infty \cup \Sigma_G)$ such that $\bar{\Sigma} = O_G \cup O_\infty \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k O_{\sigma^i}$. Hence, $M(O_G \cup O_\infty) = 1$, and therefore, $M(\Sigma_G) > 1 - \epsilon$. Since ϵ was arbitrary, we conclude that

$$M(\Sigma_G) = 1. \tag{22}$$

Now, we are going to show that $M(D)=1$. For $x \in K$ and $m \leq 0$, set

$$A_x^{m-1} := \left\{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma} \middle|\ d\left(X_m(\sigma), X_{m-1}(\sigma)\right) > a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} 2C(x)\right\}.$$

Then, by (17),

$$P_x^{m-n}\left(A_x^{m-1}\right) \leq a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}}$$

for all $x \in K$, $m \leq 0$ and $n \geq 1$. Hence

$$\phi_m^n\left(A_{x_0}^m\right) \leq a^{\frac{-m}{2}} \tag{23}$$

for all $m \leq -1$ and $n \geq 1$. Therefore, by (21) and (19), as $A_{x_0}^m \cap \bigcup_{e_m,\ldots,e_0 \in E} {}_m[e_m,\ldots,e_0]$ is a countable union of some open cylinder sets,

$$M\left(A_{x_0}^m\right) = M\left(A_{x_0}^m \setminus \Omega_\infty\right) \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \phi_m^{n_k}\left(A_{x_0}^m \cap \bigcup_{e_m,\ldots,e_0 \in E} {}_m[e_m,\ldots,e_0]\right) \leq a^{\frac{-m}{2}}$$

for all $m \leq -1$.

Now, set

$$A_{x_0} := \bigcap_{l \leq -1} \bigcup_{m \leq l} A_{x_0}^m.$$

Then

$$M\left(A_{x_0}\right) \leq \sum_{m \leq l} M\left(A_{x_0}^m\right) \leq \sum_{m \leq l} a^{\frac{-m}{2}} \text{ for all } l \leq -1.$$

Hence

$$M\left(A_{x_0}\right) = 0.$$

Now, observer that for every $\sigma \in \Sigma_G \setminus A_{x_0}$, sequence $(X_m(\sigma))_{m \leq 0}$ is Cauchy. Hence, by the completeness of (K,d), $\Sigma_G \setminus A_{x_0} \subset D$. Therefore,

$$M(D) = 1. \tag{24}$$

Now, we are going to compute $E_M(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F})$ for all $e \in E$. Fix $e \in E$. First, observe that, for $x \in K$, $m \leq 0$, $n \geq 0$ and ${}_m[e_m,\ldots,e_0] \subset \bar{\Sigma}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{{}_m[e_m,\ldots,e_0]} 1_{{}_1[e]} dP_x^{m-n} \\
= & \sum_{e_{m-n},\ldots,e_{m-1} \in E} P_x^{m-n}\left({}_{m-n}[e_{m-n},\ldots,e_{m-1},e_m,\ldots,e_0,e]\right) \\
= & \ U^n\left(P_\cdot^m({}_m[e_m,\ldots,e_0]) p_e \circ w_{e_0} \circ \ldots \circ w_{e_m}\right)(x) \\
= & \int \int_{{}_m[e_m,\ldots,e_0]} p_e \circ w_{\sigma_0} \circ \ldots \circ w_{\sigma_m}(y) dP_y^m(\sigma) dU^{*n}\delta_x(y) \\
= & \int_{{}_m[e_m,\ldots,e_0]} p_e \circ X_m(\sigma) dP_x^{m-n}(\sigma) + r_{mn,x}\left({}_m[e_m,\ldots,e_0]\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $r_{mn,x}$ is a signed measure on $\mathcal{F}_m$ given by

$$r_{mn,x}\left(A\right) := \int \int\limits_{A} \left(p_e \circ w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_m}(y) - p_e \circ X_m(\sigma)\right) dP^m_y(\sigma) dU^{*n}\delta_x(y)$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_m$. Hence, as every member of $\mathcal{F}_m$ can be written as a countable disjoint union of cylinder sets,

$$\int\limits_{A} 1_{1[e]} d\phi^n_m = \int\limits_{A} p_e \circ X_m d\phi^n_m + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} r_{mk,x_0}(A)$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_m$ and $m < 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This implies, by (18) and (21), that

$$\int\limits_{A} 1_{1[e]} dM = \int\limits_{A} p_e \circ X_m dM + \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{n_k}\sum_{k=1}^{n_k} r_{mk,x_0}(A) \tag{26}$$

for all A which are finite unions of cylinder sets from $\mathcal{F}_m$ and $m < 0$. Now, for $y \in K$ and $m \leq 0$, set

$$B_{m,y} := \left\{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma} |\ d(w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_m}(y), X_m(\sigma)) > a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} C(y)\right\}$$

and

$$\beta_e(t) := \sup_{x,y \in K_{i(e)}, d(x,y) \leq t} \{p_e(x) - p_e(y)\} \text{ for all } t \geq 0.$$

Then, by (16),

$$P^m_y\left(B_{m,y}\right) \leq a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} \text{ for all } y \in K \text{ and } m \leq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$|r_{mk,x_0}(A)| \quad \leq \quad a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} + \int \beta_e\left(a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} C(y)\right) dU^{*k}\delta_{x_0}(y) \tag{27}$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_m$, $m \leq 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $\rho := b/(1-a) + L(x_0)$ and

$$B(\alpha) := \bigcap_{j \in N} (K \setminus K_j) \cup B_\alpha(x_j)$$

for all $\alpha \geq 0$. Then, by (15),

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &\geq U^k L(x_0) \\
&= \int \sum_{j\in N} d(w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x_0), x_j) 1_{K_j} \circ w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x_0) dP^1_{x_0}(\sigma) \\
&\geq \frac{2\rho}{\epsilon} \sum_{j\in N} P^1_{x_0}\left(d(w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x_0), x_j) > \frac{2\rho}{\epsilon} \text{ and } w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x_0) \in K_j\right) \\
&\geq \frac{2\rho}{\epsilon} P^1_{x_0}\left(w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x_0) \in K \setminus B\left(\frac{2\rho}{\epsilon}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Hence

$$P^1_{x_0}\left(w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x_0) \in K \setminus B\left(\frac{2\rho}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \text{ for all } k \geq 1.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} U^{*k}\delta_{x_0}\left(K \setminus B\left(\frac{2\rho}{\epsilon}\right)\right) &= \int 1_{K\setminus B\left(\frac{2\rho}{\epsilon}\right)} \circ w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x_0) dP^1_{x_0}(\sigma) \\ &= P^1_{x_0}\left(w_{\sigma_k} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_1}(x_0) \in K \setminus B\left(\frac{2\rho}{\epsilon}\right)\right) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, set $C_\epsilon := 2\rho/\epsilon + b/(1-a)$. Then $C(y) \leq C_\epsilon$ for all $y \in B(2\rho/\epsilon)$. Therefore, by (27),

$$|r_{mk,x_0}(A)| \leq a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} + \beta_e\left(a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} C_\epsilon\right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_m$, $m \leq 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, by (26),

$$\left|\int_A 1_{{}_1[e]} dM - \int_A p_e \circ X_m dM\right| \leq a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} + \beta_e\left(a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} C_\epsilon\right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for all A which are finite unions of cylinder sets from $\mathcal{F}_m$ and $m < 0$, and, since every member of $\mathcal{F}_m$ can be written as a countable union of cylinder sets, by Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, it holds true for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_m$ and $m < 0$. That is

$$\left|\int_A \left(E_M\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}_m\right) - p_e \circ X_m\right) dM\right| \leq a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} + \beta_e\left(a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} C_\epsilon\right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_m$ and $m < 0$. Set $A^-_m := \{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma} |\ E\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}_m\right)(\sigma) \leq p_e \circ X_m(\sigma)\}$. Then

$$\int_{A^-_m} \left|E_M\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}_m\right) - p_e \circ X_m\right| dM \leq a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} + \beta_e\left(a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} C_\epsilon\right) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}$$

and, obviously, the same inequality holds true also with $\bar{\Sigma} \setminus A^-_m$ in place of A^-_m for all $m < 0$. Hence

$$\int \left|E_M\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}_m\right) - p_e \circ X_m\right| dM \leq 2a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} + 2\beta_e\left(a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} C_\epsilon\right) + \epsilon \qquad (28)$$

for all $m < 0$. Let $\sigma \in D$. Observe that $X_m(\sigma) \in K_{t(\sigma_0)}$ for all $m \leq 0$. Therefore, $\lim_{m\to-\infty} p_e \circ X_m(\sigma) = \bar{p}_e \circ F(\sigma)$ if $i(e) = t(\sigma_0)$. Otherwise, $\lim_{m\to-\infty} p_e \circ X_m(\sigma) = 0$. Hence, since $M(D) = 1$,

$$\lim_{m\to-\infty} p_e \circ X_m(\sigma) = \bar{p}_e \circ F(\sigma) 1_{K_{i(e)}}\left(x_{t(\sigma_0)}\right) \text{ for } M\text{-a.a. } \sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}.$$

Therefore, by Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, $p_e \circ X_m(\sigma)$ converges to $\bar{p}_e \circ F(\sigma) 1_{K_{i(e)}}(x_{t(\sigma_0)})$ in $\mathcal{L}^1(M)$. Therefore, by the triangle inequality and (28), as $E_M\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}_m\right)$ also converges to $E_M\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right)$ in $\mathcal{L}^1(M)$,

$$\int \left|E_M\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right)(\sigma) - \bar{p}_e \circ F(\sigma) 1_{K_{i(e)}}\left(x_{t(\sigma_0)}\right)\right| dM(\sigma) \leq \epsilon.$$

Since ϵ was arbitrary, we conclude that

$$E_M\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right)(\sigma) = \bar{p}_e \circ F(\sigma) 1_{K_{i(e)}}\left(x_{t(\sigma_0)}\right) \quad \text{for } M\text{-a.a. } \sigma \in \bar{\Sigma}$$

for all $e \in E$. Thus $M \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$. This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) Inclusion $E(\mathcal{M}) \subset \Phi(P(\mathcal{M}))$ follows from Lemma 2 (i) and Proposition 1.

Now, we show that $\Phi(P(\mathcal{M})) \subset \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$. Set $G_m := \{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma} |\ (\sigma_m, ..., \sigma_{|m|}) \text{ is a path}\}$ for all $m < 0$. Then, by Remark 1, $\Phi(\mu)(G_m) = 1$ for all $m < 0$. As $\Sigma_G = \bigcap_{m<0} G_m$ and $G_{m-1} \subset G_m$ for all $m < 0$, it follows that

$$\Phi(\mu)(\Sigma_G) = 1. \tag{29}$$

The integration of (17) with respect to μ implies that

$$\int d\left(X_m, X_{m-1}\right) d\Phi(\mu) \leq a^{-m+1} 2 \int C(x)\mu(x)$$

for all $m \leq 0$. By Lemma 10, $\int C(x)\mu(x) \leq 2b/(1-a)$, therefore we can define

$$A_{m-1} := \{\sigma \in \bar{\Sigma} |\ d\left(X_m(\sigma), X_{m-1}(\sigma)\right) > a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} 2C_1\}$$

with $C_1 := 2b/(1-a)$ for all $m \leq 0$. Then

$$\Phi(\mu)\left(A_m\right) \leq a^{\frac{-m}{2}} \tag{30}$$

for all $m \leq -1$, and the same way as for (24), this implies that

$$\Phi(\mu)(D) = 1.$$

Now, let $e \in E$. The integration of (25) with respect to μ gives

$$\int\limits_{{}_m[e_m,...,e_0]} 1_{{}_1[e]} d\Phi(\mu) = \int\limits_{{}_m[e_m,...,e_0]} p_e \circ X_m d\Phi(\mu) + r_m\left({}_m[e_m, ..., e_0]\right) \tag{31}$$

for all ${}_m[e_m, ..., e_0] \in \mathcal{F}_m$ where r_m is given by

$$r_m(A) := \int \int\limits_A \left(p_e \circ w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_m}(y) - p_e \circ X_m(\sigma)\right) dP_y^m(\sigma) d\mu(y).$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_m$. Furthermore, the integration of (16) gives

$$\int \int d\left(w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_m}(y), X_m(\sigma)\right) dP_y^m(\sigma) d\mu(y) \leq a^{-m+1} C_1. \tag{32}$$

for all $m \leq 0$. Hence, the same way as for (27), it follows that

$$|r_m(A)| \quad \leq \quad a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} + \beta_e\left(a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}}C_1\right) \tag{33}$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_m$. Therefore, as in the proof of (i), (31) implies that

$$E_{\Phi(\mu)}\left(1_{1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right) = \bar{p}_e \circ F1_{T_{i(e)}} \quad \Phi(\mu)\text{-a.e.}$$

for all $e \in E$. Thus $\Phi(\mu) \in \tilde{E}(\mathcal{M})$, as desired.

Next, we show that $F(\Phi(\mu)) = \mu$. It is sufficient to show that the measures agree on all bounded uniformly continuous non-negative functions on K (as this set of functions is closed under multiplication and generates Borel σ-algebra). Let $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$ be bounded and uniformly continuous. Observe that, for each $m \leq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int f d\mu &= \int U^{-m+1}(f) d\mu \\
&= \int\int f \circ w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_m}(x) dP_x^m(\sigma) d\mu(x) \\
&= \int f \circ X_m d\Phi(\mu) + R_m
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where

$$R_m := \int\int \left(f \circ w_{\sigma_0} \circ ... \circ w_{\sigma_m}(y) - f \circ X_m(\sigma)\right) dP_y^m(\sigma) d\mu(y).$$

Since f is uniformly continuous and bounded, one sees, by the contraction condition, the same way as for (33), that $|R_m| \to 0$ as $m \to -\infty$. Therefore, since $\Phi(\mu)(D) = 1$, by the already shown, (34) implies by Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem that

$$\int f d\mu = \int f \circ F d\Phi(\mu) = \int f dF(\Phi(\mu)),$$

as desired.

(iii) Now, set

$$Q_k := \bigcap_{m < -k} \bar{\Sigma} \setminus A_m$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By (30), $\sum_{k \geq n} \Phi(\mu)(\bar{\Sigma} \setminus Q_k) \leq 1/(1-\sqrt{a})a^{n/2}$ for all $\mu \in P(\mathcal{M})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\Phi(\mu)(D) = 1$ for all $\mu \in P(\mathcal{M})$, we can assume $Q_k \subset D$ for all k. The proof that $F|_{Q_k}$ is locally Hölder continuous is the same as that of Lemma 3 (iii) in [14]. We give it for completeness here. Let $\sigma, \sigma' \in Q_l$ for some $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, by the triangle inequality,

$$d\left(X_m(\sigma), X_{m-k}(\sigma)\right) \leq \sum_{i \leq m} a^{\frac{-i+1}{2}} 2C_1 = 2C_1 \frac{1}{1-\sqrt{a}}\, a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}} \text{ for all } m \leq -l,\ k \geq 1.$$

Hence

$$d\left(X_m(\sigma),F(\sigma)\right)\leq 2C_1\frac{1}{1-\sqrt{a}}\ a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}}\ \text{for all } m\leq -l.$$

The same way,

$$d\left(X_m(\sigma'),F(\sigma')\right)\leq 2C_1\frac{1}{1-\sqrt{a}}\ a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}}\ \text{for all } m\leq -l.$$

Now, let $d'(\sigma,\sigma')=(1/2)^{-m+1}$ for some $m\leq -l$. Then $X_m(\sigma')=X_m(\sigma)$. Therefore,

$$d\left(F(\sigma),F(\sigma')\right)\leq\frac{4C_1}{1-\sqrt{a}}\ a^{\frac{-m+1}{2}}=\frac{8b}{(1-\sqrt{a})(1-a)}\ d'(\sigma,\sigma')^{\log\sqrt{a}/\log(1/2)}.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Corollary 1 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is contractive, uniformly continuous and non-degenerate such that $b<\infty$. Then the following holds true.*
(i) Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ has a dominating Markov chain. Then $E(\mathcal{M})$ is not empty if and only if Condition 2 is satisfied.
(ii) Φ is the inverse of $F:E(\mathcal{M})\longrightarrow P(\mathcal{M})$. (Thus, the latter does not depend on the choice of $x_i\in K_i$ for all $i\in N$ as long b remains finite.)

Proof. (i) The 'only if' part follows from Lemma 2(iv). The 'if' part follows from Theorem 5 (i) and Theorem 2.

(ii) The assertion follows by Theorem 5 (iii), Theorem 2 and Lemma 2 (i). □

3.3.2 Invariant measures

Obviously, any Borel probability measure on $\bigcup_{i\in S}K_i$ can be uniquely identified with a member of $P(\bigcup_{i\in S}K_i)$. The following simple proposition enables one to reduce the problem of determining whether a Markov systems has an invariant measure to that on a subsystem, which might be easier.

Definition 6 We say that $\mathcal{M}$ has a *Markov subsystem* iff there exists $S\subset N$ such that $(K_{i(e)},w_e,p_e)_{e\in i^{-1}(S)}$ is a Markov system on $\bigcup_{i\in S}K_i$.

Proposition 2 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ has a Markov subsystem $(K_{i(e)},w_e,p_e)_{e\in i^{-1}(S)}$, for some $S\subset N$, which has an invariant $\mu\in P(\bigcup_{i\in S}K_i)$. Then $\mu\in P(\mathcal{M})$.*

Proof. Let $B\subset K$ be Borel. Then

$$\begin{aligned}U^*\mu(B) &= \int\sum_{e\in E}p_e 1_B\circ w_e d\mu=\int\limits_{\bigcup\limits_{i\in S}K_i}\sum_{e\in i^{-1}(S)}p_e 1_{B\cap\bigcup\limits_{i\in S}K_i}\circ w_e d\mu\\ &= \mu\left(B\cap\bigcup_{i\in S}K_i\right)=\mu(B).\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is contractive and uniformly continuous such that $b < \infty$. Then the following holds true.*
(i) Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is non-degenerate and has a dominating Markov chain. Then $P(\mathcal{M})$ is not empty if and only if Condition 2 is satisfied.
(ii) Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is consistent, has a dominating Markov chain and satisfies Condition 2. Then $P(\mathcal{M})$ is not empty.
(iii) $P(\mathcal{M})$ is uniformly tight.

Proof. (i) The assertion follows by Corollary 1 and Proposition 1.

(ii) The assertion follows by Theorem 5 (i).

(iii) Let $\epsilon > 0$. By Theorem 5 (iii), there exists a Borel set $Q \subset \bar{\Sigma}$ with $Q \subset \Sigma_G$ such that $\Phi(\mu)(Q) > 1 - \epsilon$ for all $\mu \in P(\mathcal{M})$ and $F|_Q$ is uniformly continuous with respect to d'. Let $\bar{Q}$ denote the closure of Q in $\bar{\Sigma}$ and $\tilde{Q}$ denote the closure of Q in (Σ_G, d'). Let $C \subset \bar{\Sigma}$ be closed such that $Q \subset C$. Hence $\Sigma_G \setminus (C \cap \Sigma_G) = \Sigma_G \cap (\bar{\Sigma} \setminus C)$ is open in the induced topology on Σ_G. That is $C \cap \Sigma_G$ is closed in the induced topology. Since d' generates exactly the induced topology on Σ_G, we conclude that $\tilde{Q} \subset C \cap \Sigma_G$, and therefore, $\tilde{Q} \subset \bar{Q}$. Since $\bar{Q}$ is compact, $\bar{Q} \cap \Sigma_G$ is compact in the induced topology. Since $\tilde{Q} \subset \bar{Q} \cap \Sigma_G$, $\tilde{Q}$ is compact in the topology generated by d'.

Now, let $\tilde{F}$ be the continuous extension of $F|_Q$ on $\tilde{Q}$. Set $\tilde{C} := \tilde{F}(\tilde{Q})$. Then $\tilde{C}$ is compact and by Theorem 5 (iii),

$$\mu\left(\tilde{C}\right) = \Phi(\mu)\left(F^{-1}\left(\tilde{C}\right)\right) \geq \Phi(\mu)\left(F^{-1}\left(\tilde{F}(Q)\right)\right) \geq \Phi(\mu)\left(Q\right) > 1 - \epsilon$$

for all $\mu \in P(\mathcal{M})$. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 3 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is contractive and uniformly continuous such that $b < \infty$. Then $P(\mathcal{M})$ is not empty if $\mathcal{M}$ is consistent and has a dominating Markov chain such that $c < \infty$.*

Proof. By the hypothesis, there exists $\xi > 0$ such that (12) is satisfied. Let $k > 0$. Then for every $x \in K$ and $j \in N$,

$$\begin{aligned} U^{*k}\delta_x\left(K_j\right) &= \sum_{e_{-k},\ldots,e_{-2} \in E} P_x^{-k}\left({}_{-k}[e_{-k},..,e_{-2}]\right) \\ &\quad \times \sum_{e \in E, t(e)=j} p_e\left(w_{\sigma_{-2}} \circ \ldots \circ w_{\sigma_{-k}} x\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{e_{-k},\ldots,e_{-2} \in E} P_x^{-k}\left({}_{-k}[e_{-k},..,e_{-2}]\right) \\ &\quad \times \sum_{e \in E, i(e)=t(e_{-2}), t(e)=j} \; \sup_{x \in K_{t(e_{-2})}} p_e(x) \\ &\leq \xi \sup_{i \in N} q_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

where $(q_{ij})_{i,j\in N}$ is the transition matrix of the dominating Markov chain. Fix $x_0 \in K$ and, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$\alpha_n(\{j\}) := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} U^{*k}\delta_{x_0}(K_j)$$

for all $j \in N$. Then

$$\alpha_n(\{j\}) \le \xi \sup_{i\in N} q_{ij}$$

for all $j \in N$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\epsilon > 0$. By the hypothesis, there exists a finite $V_\epsilon \subset N$ such that $\sum_{j\in N\setminus V_\epsilon} \sup_{i\in N} q_{ij} < \epsilon/\xi$. Then $\alpha_n(N\setminus V_\epsilon) < \epsilon$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, the assertion follow by Corollary 2 (ii). □

Condition 3 *Suppose* Ω *is either empty or of the form* $\bigcup_{i\in S} K_i$ *for some* $S \subset N$ *such that* $\bigcup_{i\in S} K_i$ *is closed and* $(K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e\in i^{-1}(S)}$ *is a consistent Markov subsystem.*

Corollary 4 *Suppose* $\mathcal{M}$ *is contractive such that* $b < \infty$*, uniformly continuous, has a dominating Markov chain such that* $c < \infty$ *and satisfies Condition 3. Then* $P(\mathcal{M})$ *is not empty.*

Proof. If Ω is empty, then, by Lemma 6, $\mathcal{M}$ is non-degenerate, and therefore, the assertion follows by Corollary 3.

Now, suppose Ω is not empty. Then, by the hypothesis, there exists a Markov subsystem on a complete metric space which, by Corollary 3, has an invariant measure. Therefore, by Proposition 2, $P(\mathcal{M})$ is not empty. □

4 Examples and applications

In this section, in particular, some simple examples are given to which the previous theory apparently could not be applied.

Example 1 This is to demonstrate that Proposition 1, Corollary 1 and Theorem 1 cover Theorem 2.1 in [11].

Let $G := (V, E, i, t)$ be a finite directed graph. Set $\Sigma_G^- := \{(..., \sigma_{-1}, \sigma_0)|\ \sigma_m \in E \text{ and } t(\sigma_m) = i(\sigma_{m-1}) \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}\setminus\mathbb{N}\}$ (be the *one-sided subshift of finite type* associated with G) endowed with the metric $d(\sigma, \sigma') := 2^k$ where k is the smallest integer with $\sigma_i = \sigma'_i$ for all $k < i \le 0$. Let $T : \Sigma_G^- \longrightarrow \Sigma_G^-$ be the right shift map given by $(T\sigma)_i = \sigma_{i-1}$ for all $i \le 0$. Let g be a positive continuous function on Σ_G^- such that

$$\sum_{y\in T^{-1}(\{x\})} g(y) = 1 \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma_G^-.$$

Set $K_i := \left\{\sigma \in \Sigma_G^- : t(\sigma_0) = i\right\}$ for every $i \in V$ and, for every $e \in E$,

$$w_e(\sigma) := (..., \sigma_{-1}, \sigma_0, e),\ \ p_e(\sigma) := g(..., \sigma_{-1}, \sigma_0, e) \text{ for all } \sigma \in K_{i(e)}.$$

Obviously, maps $(w_e|_{K_{i(e)}})_{e\in E}$ are contractions with a contraction rate $a = 1/2$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}_g := \left(K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e\right)_{e\in E}$ defines a uniformly continuous contractive Markov system. Since each K_i is open, $\mathcal{M}_g$ is non-degenerate ($R1 = 0$). Therefore, by Corollary 2 (i), it has an invariant Borel probability measure. An invariant probability measure of $\mathcal{M}_g$ is called a *g-measure* [7]. Let U_g be the Markov operator associated with $\mathcal{M}_g$. Then, for every $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(\Sigma_G^-)$,

$$U_g f(x) = \sum_{y\in T^{-1}(\{x\})} g(y)f(y) \text{ for all } x \in \Sigma_G^-.$$

Observe that, in this case, F is nothing else but the natural projection $\Sigma_G \longrightarrow \Sigma_G^-$ and Φ is the natural extension of a shift invariant measure. Moreover, in this example, statements (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 5 and Corollary 2 (iii) are obvious, Theorem 5 (iii) can be strengthened to globally Hölder continuous F and Proposition 1, Corollary 1 (ii) and Theorem 1 reduce to Theorem 2.1 in [11] as follows. Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote the Borel σ-algebra on Σ_G^-, $P(\Sigma_G^-)$ denote the set of all Borel probability measures on Σ_G^- and $P_T(\Sigma_G^-)$ denote the set of all T-invariant members of $P(\Sigma_G^-)$.

Theorem 6 (Ledrappier, 1974 [11]) *Let $m \in P(\Sigma_G^-)$. Then the following are equivalent:*
(i) ${U_g}^*m = m$,
(ii) $m \in P_T(\Sigma_G^-)$ and $E_m(f|T^{-1}\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{z\in T^{-1}\{Tx\}} g(z)f(z)$ m-a.e. for all $f \in \mathcal{L}^1(m)$,
(iii) $m \in P_T(\Sigma_G^-)$ and m is an equilibrium state for $\log g$.

Proof. Let ${U_g}^*m = m$. Then, by Corollary 1 (ii), $\Phi(m) \in E(\mathcal{M}_g)$, i.e. $\Phi(m)$ is S-invariant and

$$E_{\Phi(m)}\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right) = p_e \circ F \quad \Phi(m)\text{-a.e.}$$

for all $e \in E$. Hence, m is T-invariant, as $F \circ S = T \circ F$. Let $A \in T^{-1}\mathcal{B}$ and $e \in E$. Let ${}_0[e]^-$ denote the cylinder set in Σ_G^-. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\int\limits_A 1_{{}_0[e]^-} dm = \int\limits_{F^{-1}(A)} 1_{{}_0[e]} d\Phi(m) = \int\limits_{F^{-1}(T(A))} 1_{{}_1[e]} d\Phi(m) \\ = &\int\limits_{F^{-1}(T(A))} p_e \circ F d\Phi(m) = \int\limits_{T(A)} p_e dm = \int\limits_{T(A)} \sum_{\sigma\in T^{-1}\{x\}} g(\sigma)1_{{}_0[e]^-}(\sigma)dm(x) \\ = &\int\limits_A \sum_{\sigma\in T^{-1}\{Tx\}} g(\sigma)1_{{}_0[e]^-}(\sigma)dm(x). \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Hence, for any other cylinder set ${}_k[e_k, ..., e_0]^- \subset \Sigma_G^-$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_A 1_{{}_k[e_k,\dots,e_0]^-}dm &= \int\limits_{A\cap {}_k[e_k,\dots,e_{-1}]^-} 1_{{}_0[e_0]^-}dm \\ &= \int\limits_{A\cap {}_k[e_k,\dots,e_{-1}]^-} \sum_{\sigma\in T^{-1}\{Tx\}} g(\sigma)1_{{}_0[e_0]^-}(\sigma)dm(x) \\ &= \int\limits_A \sum_{\sigma\in T^{-1}\{Tx\}} g(\sigma)1_{{}_k[e_k,\dots,e_0]^-}(\sigma)dm(x).\end{aligned}$$

By linearity, we obtain

$$\int\limits_A sdm = \int\limits_A \sum_{\sigma\in T^{-1}\{Tx\}} g(\sigma)s(\sigma)dm(x)$$

for any simple function $s \in \mathcal{L}^1(m)$. Since the simple functions are dense in $\mathcal{L}^1(m)$, we conclude

$$E_m(f|T^{-1}\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{z\in T^{-1}\{Tx\}} g(z)f(z) \quad m\text{-a.e. for all } f \in \mathcal{L}^1(m).$$

This show the implication from (i) to (ii).

Form (ii) and (35), we obtain

$$E_{\Phi(m)}\left(1_{{}_1[e]}|\mathcal{F}\right) = p_e \circ F \quad \Phi(m)\text{-a.e.}$$

for all $e \in E$. Therefore, $\Phi(m) \in E(\mathcal{M}_g)$. Hence, by Theorem 1, $\Phi(m)$ is an equilibrium state for u. Observe that $h_m(T) = h_{\Phi(m)}(S)$, since $\Phi(m)$ is the natural extension of m. Therefore,

$$h_m(T) = \int ud\Phi(m) = \int \log p_{\sigma_1} \circ F(\sigma)d\Phi(m)(\sigma) = \int \log gdm. \tag{36}$$

Thus m is an equilibrium state for $\log g$. This proves the implication from (ii) to (iii).

Finally, by (36), $\Phi(m) \in E(u)$ if m is an equilibrium state for $\log g$. Hence, by Theorem 1 and Proposition 1, $U_g{}^*m = m$. This completes the proof. □

Example 2 Consider the following random dynamical system $D_R := ((\mathbb{R}, |.|), w_n, p_n)_{n\geq 3}$ where

$$w_n(x) := Z\sqrt{\log 2}\sqrt{\log n}x + 1 \text{ and } p_n(x) := \frac{1}{Z}\frac{1}{n(\log n)^2}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \geq 3$ where Z is the suitable normalizing factor such that $\sum_{n\geq 3} p_n = 1$. Then a simple computation shows that

$$\sum_{n\geq 3} p_n|w_n(x) - w_n(y)| \leq \sqrt{\log 2}\int\limits_2^\infty \frac{\sqrt{\log t}}{t(\log t)^2}dt|x-y| = \frac{1}{2}|x-y|$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. D_R is contractive with a contraction rate $1/2$. Also, for any choice of $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$b = \sum_{n \geq 3} p_n |w_n(x_0) - x_0| \leq \frac{1}{2} x_0 + |1 - x_0|.$$

It is, obviously, non-degenerate. Thus by Corollary 2 (i) and Corollary 1, D_R has a unique invariant Borel probability measure μ. However, one easily checks that the Bernoulli measure $\Phi(\mu)$ has infinite entropy, i.e. $\{M \in E(\mathcal{M}) | \ h_S(M) < \infty\}$ is empty.

Example 3 Consider the random dynamical system $([0,1], w_e, p_e)_{e \in \{0,1\}}$ where

$$w_0(x) := \frac{1}{2}x, \qquad w_1 x := \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}x,$$
$$p_0(x) := x, \qquad p_1(x) := 1 - x$$

for all $x \in [0,1]$. The following Markov partition makes the random dynamical system to a uniformly continuous Markov system with strictly positive probability functions. Set $K_1 := \{0\}$, $K_2 := (0,1)$, $K_3 := \{1\}$,

$$w_a := w_1|_{K_1}, w_b := w_0|_{K_2}, w_c := w_1|_{K_2}, w_d := w_0|_{K_3}$$
$$p_a := p_1|_{K_1}, p_b := p_0|_{K_2}, p_c := p_1|_{K_2}, w_d := p_0|_{K_3},$$

and $i : \{a, b, c, d\} \longrightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ by $i(a) := 1$, $i(b) := 2$, $i(c) := 2$, $i(d) := 3$. Obviously, $R1 = 1_{\{0\} \cup \{1\}}$ and

$$R^2 1 = \sum_{e \in \{a,b,c,d\}} \partial p_e 1_{\{0\} \cup \{1\}} \circ \bar{w}_e = 0.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 6, Markov system $(K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e \in \{a,b,c,d\}}$ satisfies the conditions of Corollary 2 (i). One can choose also an infinite Markov partition, e.g. $K_1 := \{0\}$, $K_0 := \{1\}$, $K_i := (1 - 1/2^{i-2}, 1 - 1/2^{i-1}]$ for all $i \geq 2$. Then one easily sees (by drawing the directed graph of the Markov system) that

$$R1 = 1_{\{0\}} + 1_{\{1 - \frac{1}{2}\}} + 1_{\{1 - \frac{1}{4}\}} + ...,$$

$$R^2 1 = 1_{\{0\}} + \frac{1}{2} 1_{\{1 - \frac{1}{2}\}} + \frac{1}{4} 1_{\{1 - \frac{1}{4}\}} + \frac{1}{8} 1_{\{1 - \frac{1}{8}\}} + ...$$

and

$$R^3 1 = \frac{1}{2} 1_{\{0\}} + \frac{1}{8} 1_{\{1 - \frac{1}{2}\}} + \frac{1}{32} 1_{\{1 - \frac{1}{4}\}} + ...$$

Since $R^3 1 < 1$, by Lemma 6, the resulting Markov system is non-degenerate, and therefore, also satisfies the conditions of Corollary 2 (i) for any choice of $x_i \in K_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. (Note that the dominating Markov chain has a positively recurrent class.)

Example 4 Consider the random dynamical system $([0,1], w_e, p_e)_{e\in\{0,1\}}$ where w_0 and w_1 as in Example 3, but

$$p_0(x) := 1 - x,\ \ p_1(x) := x$$

for all $x \in [0,1]$. The random dynamical system has a following equivalent proper Markov system $\mathcal{M} := (K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e\in\{a,b,c,d\}}$ where $K_1 := \{0\}$, $K_2 := (0,1)$, $K_3 := 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} w_a &:= w_0|_{K_1}, w_b := w_0|_{K_2}, w_c := w_1|_{K_2}, w_d := w_1|_{K_3} \\ p_a &:= p_0|_{K_1}, p_b := p_0|_{K_2}, p_c := p_1|_{K_2}, w_d := p_1|_{K_3}, \end{aligned}$$

and $i : \{a,b,c,d\} \longrightarrow \{1,2,3\}$ by $i(a) := 1$, $i(b) := 2$, $i(c) := 2$, $i(d) := 3$. If one draws the directed graph associated with the Markov system, one can see that $(K_{i(e)}, p_e, w_e)_{e\in i^{-1}(\{1,3\})}$ forms a Markov subsystem which has more than one invariant probability measures. Thus, by Proposition 2, the Markov system also has more then one invariant probability measure. Moreover, note that $\partial p_a = 0$, $\partial p_b = 1_{\{0\}}$, $\partial p_c = 1_{\{1\}}$ and $\partial p_d = 0$. Hence,

$$R1 = 1_{\{0\}\cup\{1\}}.$$

Therefore, the Markov system satisfies the conditions of Corollary 4. Furthermore, $R(R1) = R1$, and therefore $\Omega = \{0\} \cup \{1\}$. Set $\sigma^0 := (..., b, b, b, ...)$. Then, obviously, $\sigma^0 \in T_2$, but $F(\sigma^0) = 0$, and therefore $\sigma^0 \in F^{-1}(K_1)$. Hence $\sigma^0 \notin G$. Set $\Lambda := \delta_{\sigma^0}$. Then, by Lamma 3, $\Lambda \notin E(\mathcal{M})$, but, obviously, $F(\Lambda) = \delta_0 \in P(\mathcal{M})$. Let $A \in \mathcal{F}$, then

$$\int\limits_A 1_{{}_1[b]} d\Lambda = \Lambda(A) = \int\limits_A 1_{K_1} \circ F 1_{T_2} d\Lambda = \int\limits_A \partial p_b \circ F 1_{T_{i(b)}} d\Lambda.$$

Hence, $\Lambda \in E_\perp(\mathcal{M})$. Thus, by Theorem 2, $\mathcal{M}$ is degenerate. However, by Theorem 4, it is consistent. Also, it can be seen by Theorem 3 (ii), as obviously, $1_\Omega Rf = 1_\Omega Uf$ for all $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(K)$, or by Lemma 7. (Interestingly, $\Lambda(F^{-1}(F(G))) \geq \Lambda(F^{-1}(\{0\})) = 1$.)

This example also can be used, in order to see that the Condition 1 is not necessary for the consistency of a Markov system. Set $K'_0 := \{0\}$, $K'_1 := \{1\}$, $K'_2 := \bigcup_{i\geq 2, even}(1 - 1/2^{i-2}, 1 - 1/2^{i-1}]$ and $K'_3 := \bigcup_{i\geq 3, odd}(1 - 1/2^{i-2}, 1 - 1/2^{i-1}]$. Then, the restrictions of the maps and probability functions form a finite uniformly continuous Markov system. In this case, also $1 \in \Omega$, but, obviously, $R1(1) = 2 > U1(1)$, as $\bar{K}'_2 \setminus K'_2 \cap \bar{K}'_3 \setminus K'_3 = \{1\}$.

Example 5 Let *Blim* be a Banach limit. Consider the following random dynamical system $(K, w_e, p_e)_{e\in\{0,1\}}$ where $K := \{(x_1, x_2, ...)|\ x_i \in [0,1] \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ equipped with the supremum norm and

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(x) &:= \frac{1}{2}x, \qquad & w_1(x) &:= \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, ...\right) + \frac{1}{2}x, \\ p_0(x) &:= Blim(x), \qquad & p_1(x) &:= 1 - p_0(x) \end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in K$. Recall that space $(K, \|.\|_\infty)$ is not separable. Since $Blim$ is continuous, it is Borel measurable. Set $K_1 := \{x \in K|\ Blim(x) = 0\}$, $K_3 := \{x \in K|\ Blim(x) = 1\}$ and $K_2 := K \setminus (K_1 \cap K_3)$. Then the random dynamical system is equivalent to the following Markov system. Set

$$w_a := w_1|_{K_1}, w_b := w_0|_{K_2}, w_c := w_1|_{K_2}, w_d := w_0|_{K_3}$$
$$p_a := p_1|_{K_1}, p_b := p_0|_{K_2}, p_c := p_1|_{K_2}, w_d := p_0|_{K_3},$$

and $i : \{a, b, c, d\} \longrightarrow 1, 2, 3$ by $i(a) := 1$, $i(b) := 2$, $i(c) := 2$, $i(d) := 3$. By the continuity of $Blim$, K_1 and K_2 are closed and $\bar{K}_2 = K$. Hence $R1 = 1_{K_1 \cup K_2}$ and $R^2 1 = 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 6, Markov system $(K_{i(e)}, w_e, p_e)_{e \in \{a,b,c,d\}}$ satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 2 (i).

The following example is probably the most useful one.

Example 6 Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_i \in [0, 1]$ for all $i \in \{0, ..., 2^n - 1\}$. Consider the random dynamical system $([0, 1], w_e, p_e)_{e \in \{0,1\}}$ where w_0 and w_1 as in Example 3,

$$p_0(x) := \sum_{i=0}^{2^n - 1} a_i 1_{Q_i}(x) + a_{2^n - 1} 1_{\{1\}}(x),$$

for all $x \in [0, 1]$, where $Q_i := [i/2^n, (i + 1)/2^n)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq 2^n - 1$, and $p_1 := 1 - p_0$. Now, set $K_i := Q_i$ for all $0 \leq i \leq 2^n - 1$ and $K_{2^n} := \{1\}$. Then $K_0, ..., K_{2^n}$ obviously form a Markov partition for the random dynamical system.

In order to construct the Markov system associated with it, set $E'_0 := \{i|\ a_i > 0, 0 \leq i \leq 2^n - 1\}$ and $w'_i := w_0|_{K_i}$ and $p'_i := p_0|_{K_i}$ for all $i \in E'_0$. Set $w'_{2^n} := w_0|_{\{1\}}$, $p'_{2^n} := p_0|_{\{1\}}$ and $E_0 := E'_0 \cup 2^n$ if $a_{2^n - 1} > 0$. Otherwise, $E_0 := E'_0$. Let $E'_1 := \{i|\ a_i < 1, 0 \leq i \leq 2^n - 1\}$ and set $w'_{-i} := w_1|_{K_i}$ and $p'_{-i} := p_1|_{K_i}$ for all $i \in E'_1$. Set $w'_{-2^n} := w_1|_{\{1\}}$, $p'_{-2^n} := p_1|_{\{1\}}$ and $E_1 := E'_1 \cup 2^n$ if $a_{2^n - 1} < 1$. Otherwise, $E_1 := E'_1$. Finally, set $E := E_0 \cup E_1$ and $i :\ E \longrightarrow \{0, ..., 2^n\}$ by $i(e) := |e|$ for all $e \in E$. Then $(K_{i(e)}, w'_e, p'_e)_{e \in E}$ is clearly a contractive uniformly continuous Markov system which is equivalent to $([0, 1], w_e, p_e)_{e \in \{0,1\}}$. Obviously,

$$R1 = \sum_{i=1}^{2^n - 1} 1_{\{\frac{i+1}{2^n}\}}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & R^{n+1} 1 = R^n (R1) \\ = & \sum_{e_1, ..., e_n} \partial p_{e_1} \partial p_{e_2} \circ \bar{w}_{e_1} \partial p_{e_n} \circ \bar{w}_{e_{n-1}} \circ ... \circ \bar{w}_{e_1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{2^n - 1} 1_{\{\frac{i+1}{2^n}\}} \right) \circ \bar{w}_{e_n} \circ ... \circ \bar{w}_{e_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since for every $e_1, ..., e_n \in E$ except for $i(e_1) = 0$ and $i(e_1) = 2^n - 1$ and $i(e_1) = 2^n$

$$\bar{w}_{e_n} \circ ... \circ \bar{w}_{e_1}\left(\left[\frac{i(e_1)}{2^n}, \frac{i(e_1)+1}{2^n}\right]\right) \subset \left(\frac{i}{2^n}, \frac{i+1}{2^n}\right)$$

for some $0 \leq i \leq 2^n - 1$, and $\partial p_e(0) = 0$ for all $e \in E$, and $\partial p_e(1) = 0$ for all $e \in E$ with $i(e) \neq 2^n - 1$,

$$R^{n+1}1 = b_{n+1}1_{\{1\}}$$

for some $0 \leq b_{n+1} \leq 1$. If $b_{n+1} < 1$, then the Markov system is non-degenerate, and therefore, has an invariant measure by Lemma 6 and Corollary 2 (i). Otherwise,

$$R^{n+2}1 = R\left(R^{n+1}1\right) = (1 - a_{2^n-1})1_{\{1\}},$$

and therefore, the Markov system is non-degenerate if $a_{2^n-1} > 0$ and it is consistent otherwise. Hence, it has an invariant measure by Corollary 3 or Corollary 4.

Example 7 Let $\mathcal{D}_r := (\mathbb{R}, w_e, p_e)_{e\in\{0,1\}}$ be the random dynamical system where w_0 and w_1 as in Example 3,

$$p_0(x) = \begin{cases} a, & x \in \mathbb{Q} \\ b, & x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q} \end{cases}$$

for some $0 \leq a, b \leq 1$, where $\mathbb{Q}$ denotes the rational numbers, and $p_1 = 1 - p_0$. Set $K_0 := \mathbb{Q}$ and $K_1 := \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. Then clearly, $\{K_0, K_1\}$ is a Markov partition for $\mathcal{D}_r$, which makes it to a uniformly continuous Markov system. For this Markov system, $\Omega = \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, Condition 1 is satisfied if and only if $Rf \leq Uf$ for all $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(\mathbb{R})$. However, one easily checks that $Rf = (a1_{K_1} + b1_{K_0})f \circ w_0 + (1 - (a1_{K_1} + b1_{K_0}))f \circ w_1$ for all $f \in \mathcal{L}^B(\mathbb{R})$. Hence, Condition 1 is satisfied if and only if $a = b$. Clearly, in this case, the Markov system has an invariant measure, in the agreement with Corollary 3.

References

[1] A. Baraviera, C. F. Lardizabal, A. O. Lopes, M. Terra Cunha, A dynamical point of view of Quantum Information: entropy, pressure and Wigner measures, in *Dynamics, Games and Science II, Springer Proceedings in Mathematics* **2** (2011) 161-185.

[2] M. F. Barnsley, S. G. Demko, J. H. Elton and J. S. Geronimo, Invariant measure for Markov processes arising from iterated function systems with place-dependent probabilities, *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré* **24** (1988) 367-394.

[3] V. I. Bogachev, Measure theory. Vol. I,II. *Springer* (2007).

[4] H. Föllmera, U. Horsta, A. Kirman, Equilibria in financial markets with heterogeneous agents: a probabilistic perspective, *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **41** (2005) 123-155.

[5] K. Horbacz and T. Szarek, Irreducible Markov systems on Polish spaces, *Studia Math.* **177** (2006), no. 3, 285–295.

[6] A. Johansson, A. Öberg, M. Pollicott, Countable state shifts and uniqueness of g-measures, *Amer. J. Math.* **129** (6) (2007) 1501-1511.

[7] M. Keane, Strongly Mixing g-Measures, *Inventiones math.* **16** (1972) 309-324.

[8] F. Ledrappier, Principe variationnel et systèmes dynamiques symboliques, *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete* **30** (1974), 185-202.

[9] W. Slomczynski, Dynamical entropy, Markov operators, and itereated function systems, *Rozprawy Habilitacyjne Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego Nr 362, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, Kraków (2003).

[10] T. Szarek, Invariant measures for nonexpansive Markov operators on Polish spaces, *Diss. Math.* **415**, 1-62 (2003).

[11] P. Walters, Ruelle's Operator Theorem and g-measures, *Tran. AMS* **214** (1975) 375-387.

[12] P. Walters, An introduction to Ergodic Theory, *Springer-Verlag* (1982).

[13] I. Werner, Contractive Markov systems, *J. London Math. Soc.* **71** (2005), no. 1, 236-258.

[14] I. Werner, Coding map for a contractive Markov system, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **140** (2) (2006) 333-347, arXiv:math/0504247.

[15] I. Werner, The generalized Markov measure as an equilibrium state, *Nonlinearity* **18** (2005) 2261-2274, arXiv:math/0503644.

[16] I. Werner, Dynamically defined measures and equilibrium states, *J. Math. Phys.* **52** 122701 (2011), arXiv:1101.2623.

[17] I. Werner, Erratum: Dynamically defined measures and equilibrium states, *J. Math. Phys.* **53** 079902 (2012), arXiv:1101.2623.

[18] I. Werner, Fundamental Markov systems, arXiv:math/0509120.